



Economic and Social
Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1994/SR.41
25 January 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Substantive session of 1994

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 41st MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 22 July 1994, at 10 a.m.

President:

Mr. DANGUE REWAKA
(Vice-President)

(Gabon)

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 5: SOCIAL, HUMANITARIAN AND HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF
SUBSIDIARY BODIES, CONFERENCES AND RELATED QUESTIONS

- (b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE THIRD DECADE TO
COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION
- (c) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO
COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE
INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS
- (d) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working
languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in
a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this
document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference
Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

In the absence of Mr. Butler (Australia), Mr. Danque Rewaka (Gabon, Vice-President, took the Chair

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 5: SOCIAL, HUMANITARIAN AND HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY BODIES, CONFERENCES AND RELATED QUESTIONS

- (b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE THIRD DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (E/1994/78, E/1994/97)
- (c) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (A/49/216, A/49/263-E/1994/112; E/1994/114, E/1994/96)
- (d) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (A/49/41, A/49/261-E/1994/110, A/49/264-E/1994/113, A/49/270-E/1994/116; E/1994/5, E/1994/23, E/1994/24, E/1994/63, E/1994/76 and Add.1, E/1994/106, E/1994/107; E/1994/107; E/1994/L.13, L.15, L.26; E/1994/NGO/6)

Mr. REMIREZ de ESTENOZ (Cuba), Acting Chairman of the Special Committee on the situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, referring to the report of the President of the Council on consultations held with the Chairman of the Special Committee said that, although the remaining Territories on the list to which the Declaration applied were small island Territories with small populations and limited resources, the General Assembly had reiterated in numerous resolutions that those factors should in no way prevent the peoples of those Territories from exercising their inalienable right to self-determination and independence, in conformity with the Charter and the Declaration. While the Special Committee continued to adhere firmly to those principles, it realized that accelerated economic and social development could only contribute to the speedy implementation of the relevant resolutions of the General Assembly. It therefore attached great importance to the contributions which the specialized agencies and other institutions of the United Nations system could make to the economic and social advancement of the peoples of Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories. He noted that substantial funds had been earmarked by the United Nations Development Programme in its fifth cycle for projects in several small island Territories of the Caribbean and Pacific and that United Nations specialized agencies and other organizations had provided assistance for reconstruction in those Territories in those two regions which had been struck by hurricanes.

The United Nations and its specialized agencies had an important role to play in the implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, which had been adopted at the Global Conference held in Barbados earlier in 1994, and in supplementing national efforts. The Special Committee hoped that due consideration would be given to the needs of the Trust and Non-Self-Governing Territories in the

(Mr. Ramirez de Estenoz, Cuba)

implementation of the Programme of Action. The recent seminars organized by the Special Committee had the representatives of Non-Self-Governing Territories to present their views on the various problems affecting their economies and the action which could be taken to resolve them. One of their main requests was for greater opportunity to participate in the work of the specialized agencies and international institutions associated with the United Nations. Some progress had already been made in that area and the Special Committee hoped that more agencies would grant their requests. Other requests were that international organizations should assist Non-Self-Governing Territories in upgrading their indigenous technological infrastructures and in promoting successful local technologies; that international and regional organizations should assist in developing a regional programme of cooperation in the management of regional economic zones aimed, inter alia, at protecting marine resources from illegal exploitation; that the United Nations, in cooperation with the administering Powers, should place greater emphasis on methods of teaching self-sufficiency; that international institutions should assist in the preparation of development programmes; that the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Bank should make available appropriate resources and expertise to the Non-Self-Governing Territories to enable them to participate in regional organizations; that information programmes should be launched to educate both the local population and tourists about the need to safeguard the environment of the Territories; and that Non-Self-Governing Territories should participate fully in regional conventions and programmes relating to their environment and future livelihood. The Special Committee hoped that the appropriate agencies and institutions would carefully study those requests and would contribute generously to the solution of the problems raised. Coordinated assistance programmes tailored to meet the specific needs of the Territories, particularly with respect to the diversification of their economies, would reduce their dependency on external factors and create optimum conditions for the free exercise of their right to self-determination.

He hoped that the draft resolution which would be proposed at the end of the general debate on the current item and which called for concrete action on the part of the specialized agencies and other institutions associated with the United Nations would receive the widest possible endorsement by the Council, thereby sending a message of hope to the peoples of the Territories concerned.

The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council should defer further consideration of the report until the following week.

It was so decided.

Mr. GHAREKHAN (Special Political Adviser to the Secretary-General), introducing the report of the Secretary-General on assistance to the Palestinian people (A/49/263-E/1994/112), said that the report detailed the steps taken so far by the Secretary-General to ensure the coordinated work of the United Nations system for an adequate response to the needs of the Palestinian people. By appointing a Special Coordinator in the Occupied Territories and convening an inter-agency meeting of United Nations programmes, the Secretary-General had laid the groundwork for and effectively coordinated programme of United Nations assistance to the Palestinian people. The United Nations agencies present in the occupied territories were actively preparing to contribute to that programme.

There had not been enough time for the Secretary-General to prepare a meaningful response to the General Assembly's request contained in resolution 48/213 that he should submit an assessment of the assistance actually received by the Palestinian people, of the needs that were still unmet and specific proposals for responding effectively to them. That assessment would be provided in an addendum to the current report, to be submitted in time for the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Council wished to take note of the reports contained in documents A/49/216, and A/49/263-E/1994/112).

It was so decided.

Mr. FALL (Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights) said that the first session of the Commission on Human Rights following the World Conference on Human Rights held at Vienna from 14 to 25 June 1993 had been of exceptional importance, as reflected in the high level of participation, the adoption of 109 resolutions and decisions and the appointment of a number of special rapporteurs. At its current session, the Economic and Social Council would be called upon to take action on four draft resolutions and 37 draft decisions which the Commission on Human Rights recommended for adoption.

At its previous session, the Commission on Human Rights had decided to create three new open-ended inter-sessional working groups. Two of the new working groups would be responsible for preparing two draft optional protocols, the first on the participation of children in armed conflicts and the second on the sale of children, the prostitution of children and pornography involving children. The third working group would consider the reform of the Commission on Human Rights and the rationalization of its work.

Of the four new special rapporteurs appointed, two had been given thematic mandates, namely, violence against women and the independence of the judiciary. The two others would be responsible for monitoring the human rights situation in Zaire and in the island of Bougainville in Papua New Guinea, respectively.

(Mr. Fall)

The Commission on Human Rights had also requested the Secretary-General to prepare a number of thematic reports on the mass exoduses cooperation with the representatives of the United Nations agencies concerned with human rights, human rights and forensic science, human rights and thematic procedures, and lastly religious intolerance. The Commission had also requested ten additional reports on the human rights situation in various countries and had adopted several resolutions in which it had requested the Secretary-General to provide technical assistance and advisory services to Governments with a view to strengthening democracy and establishing or reinforcing national structures for the promotion and protection of human rights.

The fiftieth session of the Commission had placed special emphasis on economic, social and cultural rights. The working group on the right to development had had broad consultations with the presiding officers of the various United Nations bodies concerned with human rights and with the executive secretaries of the regional commissions with the aim of creating greater awareness of development issues.

At the suggestion of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Commission on Human Rights had held a special session to consider the situation in Rwanda and had later appointed a special rapporteur to investigate at first hand the human rights situation in Rwanda and submit a preliminary report to the Commission as early as possible. The special Rapporteur was also requested to compile information on violations of human rights, breaches of international humanitarian law and crimes against humanity, including acts of genocide, in Rwanda, and to make all such information available to the Secretary-General. In his preliminary report, the Special Rapporteur had devoted special attention to the massacres, their extent in space and time, the systematic planning that had been involved and the atrocities committed, as well as the insecurity prevailing in Rwanda. He had qualified the massacres of Tutsis in the areas controlled by Government forces as genocide and had identified the causes of human rights violations as the refusal to accept democratic changes in government, incitement to ethnic hatred and violence, and impunity for crimes committed. He had concluded his report by recommending a variety of immediate, short- and medium-term measures.

In light of those conclusions, the High Commissioner for Human Rights had taken steps to enhance the effectiveness of the Special Rapporteur's actions in the field. In addition to the two human rights experts who had already been sent to the area to prepare a conceptual framework for the first-hand

(Mr. Fall)

investigations, appropriate mechanisms had been established to facilitate the task of the Special Rapporteur during his first visit to the region. An operational base had been provisionally set up at Nairobi pending the opening of additional offices at Kigali and at other locations in Rwanda.

The Human Rights Committee had continued its consideration of the reports submitted by States Parties. He regretted the considerable delay in the submission of reports and appealed to States to respect their international commitments in that regard. The Committee had also adopted two decisions inviting the Governments of Angola and Burundi, which were facing emergency situations in their respective countries, to submit special reports for its consideration.

The Committee had also pursued its standard-setting activities by adopting two general comments on articles 18 and 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which introduced clarifications of the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, and the rights of persons belonging to minorities, areas in which the work of codification was still ongoing.

In addition, the Committee had adopted a number of decisions and comments on the first Optional Protocol to the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. Although those decisions were non-binding, they were beginning to influence the jurisprudence of the highest judicial bodies of several States, a development which he welcomed.

For its part, the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights at its ninth and tenth sessions had considered 16 reports submitted by 12 States Parties to the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. It had also considered the implementation of that Covenant by two countries which had never submitted reports since their ratification of the Covenant.

Turning to questions concerning the Committee on the Rights of the Child, he noted that 162 States had so far ratified the Convention on the Rights of the Child, thus making it the international human rights instrument which had attracted the widest international support. He was therefore hopeful that the objective of the ratification of the Convention by all States by the year 1995 might be attained as a testament to the determination of the international community to ensure the promotion and protection of the rights of children.

During the period covered by its report, the Committee on the Rights of the Child had continued consideration of its working methods and ways to ensure effective coordination with other bodies in its field and to promote the dissemination of information on the Convention. At its fifth session, the Committee had adopted a number of recommendations as follow-up initiatives to improve the system for protecting children in situations of economic

(Mr. Fall)

exploitation. The informal regional meetings held by the Committee had afforded it an opportunity to become better acquainted with the real situation of children in various parts of the world.

At its fiftieth session, the Commission on Human Rights had considered the question of the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. Although apartheid had been brought to an end, racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism were assuming alarming proportions in various countries. Some States, owing to increased xenophobic and racist sentiments, had adopted drastic laws against foreigners and asylum seekers. In its resolution 1994/64, on measures to combat contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, the Commission requested the Special Rapporteur to examine incidents of contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, any form of discrimination against Blacks, Arabs and Muslims, xenophobia, negrophobia, anti-Semitism and related intolerance as well as governmental measures to overcome them. Lastly, he stressed the essential role played by the Economic and Social Council in the promotion and protection of all human rights.

Mr. RUDOLPH (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that he was very impressed by the statement which the High Commissioner for Human Rights had made in the Council at an earlier meeting and agreed with the emphasis on dialogue with Governments, system-wide coordination of human rights monitoring, the response to acute human-rights violations and prevention of such violations. In that regard, the Centre for Human Rights should be enhanced and the possibility of integrating human rights components into efforts to resolve conflicts should be further explored. Since the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action underlined the importance of strengthening the system of human rights mechanisms, the European Union fully supported the work of the four new special rapporteurs. The Union was resolutely opposed to any cut-backs affecting existing human rights mechanisms or interfere with the independent performance of their mandates. Continued efforts were needed to increase coordination and utilize the expertise of human rights mechanisms in ways best suited to the challenges facing them.

The Governments concerned must facilitate visits by special rapporteurs and give them unimpeded access to all information necessary for the fulfillment of their mandates. No country was exempt from monitoring, and the Governments of Iraq, Iran, the Sudan and Cuba should cooperate with all the relevant mechanisms. The European Union fully endorsed the recent statement of support made in Geneva for the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Sudan, who, as a result of his report to the fiftieth session of

(Mr. Rudolph, Germany)

the Commission on Human Rights, had been subjected to personal attacks by a representative of that country.

Recommendations by special rapporteurs, special representatives, independent experts and working groups were of great importance to the Commission's monitoring role and the practical work of the High Commissioner and the Centre for Human Rights. The implementation of recommendation made by the various mechanisms should become a priority matter for consideration at each session of the Commission. In that connection, he drew attention to the situation of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, the Nobel Peace Prize laureate, and the statement by the European Union on the fifth anniversary of her detention under house arrest in Myanmar (A/49/270-E/1994/116).

The report of the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Rwanda highlighted the need to call upon all parties in Rwanda to put an end to human rights violations being committed by forces under their control and resume the political reconciliation process based on the 1993 Arusha Peace Agreement. In that regard, he welcomed Security Council resolution 935 (1994), which called for the establishment of a commission of experts to examine breaches of humanitarian law in Rwanda, including acts of genocide. The European Union had expressed its concern at the very serious situations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, the Sudan, Haiti, Zaire, Iraq and Iran. It was regrettable that the continued bad human rights situations in those countries made it necessary to extend the mandates of the special rapporteurs.

Promotion of the right to development was one of the greatest challenges facing the international community. The Working Group on the Right to Development should be guided by the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. Development policies should focus on sustainable human development and fully integrate the environmental and social dimensions. Democracy and the enjoyment of human rights were essential to lasting development. Real progress in implementing the right to development depended on the willingness of Governments to ratify the two International Covenants on Human Rights and carry out their obligations in that regard. The Working Group on the Right to Development should continue its efforts to involve relevant agencies and institutions in its deliberations; and the Centre for Human Rights should sponsor joint studies with the regional institutions and non-governmental organizations concerning the interrelationship between development, democracy and human rights.

He noted with great disappointment that the budgets of both the High Commissioner and the Centre for Human Rights were completely incommensurate

(Mr. Rudolph, Germany)

with the mounting tasks entrusted to them. The current level of the human rights budgets was totally inappropriate. The European Union was determined to continue its efforts to provide adequate financing for human rights activities.

At the same time, the European Union did not accept the argument that the financing of human rights activities might divert resources from development programmes. Human rights activities were a part of, not an alternative to, development activities. Furthermore, it was incomprehensible how the activities of the Centre for Human Rights and the High Commissioner, which represented far less than 2 per cent of the regular budget of the United Nations could possibly be detrimental to any development activity.

Mr. LI Zhaoxing (China) said that the Commission on Human Rights had made certain positive efforts at its fiftieth session to implement the Vienna Declaration. The Commission had opposed the practice by which a number of countries used coercive measures to put political, economic and social pressure on developing countries and had reaffirmed the right to development as a universal and inalienable right. Nevertheless, it was regrettable that some features of the cold war, such as group confrontation, double standards and the politicization of human rights, continued to exist.

During the fiftieth session, some countries, acting as defenders of human rights, had wilfully accused and attacked developing countries and had frequently used resolutions to put political pressure on them. That practice ran counter to the spirit of mutual respect and cooperation in the field of human rights and to the Vienna Declaration. Furthermore, some countries overemphasized the universality of human rights, while neglecting special conditions in various regions and countries and ignoring one category of rights under the pretext of promoting another. That one-sided interpretation of the Declaration did not serve the cause of human rights or fundamental freedoms.

Observance of the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and comprehensive implementation of the Vienna Declaration should guide the future activities of the Commission on Human Rights. Accordingly, his delegation favoured the establishment of an open-ended working group to study the reform of the Commission to ensure that it adapted to needs of the changed world situation. What was needed was a through overhaul of the Commission to eliminate such practices as the politicization of human rights and the use of double standards and help foster dialogue and understanding among all countries. The Commission should be streamlined to reduce duplication, increase coordination and cut expenditures. Its composition should be in accordance with the principle of equitable geographical

(Mr. Li Zhaoxing, China)

distribution and its agenda should ensure a balanced approach to the various rights and full consideration of items of interest to developing countries. Lastly, such a working group should function on the basis of consensus in order to reflect fully the opinions of all parties concerned.

Mr. GORELIK (Russian Federation) said that his delegation attached considerable importance to the work of the Commission on Human Rights since the protection of human rights was an important element in maintaining international peace and security. There was a need to step up the work of the special rapporteurs and promote greater objectivity by ensuring their right to visit countries unimpeded in order to study human rights situations on the spot. The Russian Federation supported the idea of determining personal responsibility for serious violations of international humanitarian law in the territory of the former Yugoslavia. It had supported the establishment of the International Tribunal in that regard and considered it necessary to set up a similar tribunal for Rwanda. The Commission on Human Rights had sent a serious signal to the parties to the conflict in Rwanda about its readiness to take effective measures to halt the massive violations of human rights. That warning remained fully in effect and should be reinforced by the readiness of the international community to bring to justice those responsible for the tragedy.

Effective use should be made of the potential of the post of High Commissioner for Human Rights. His work should be expanded in countries where human rights were being violated and his cooperation with States and United Nations international agencies should be increased. The High Commissioner could also play an active role with regard to the territory of the former Soviet Union. His delegation attached particular importance to ensuring the rights of ethnic Russians in the newly independent States there. Increased discrimination in a number of those countries against permanent residents who maintained close ties with their ethnic homeland, Russia, caused legitimate concern. The Russian Federation was taking, within the bounds of the law, the necessary measures to protect and support those persons. The international community in turn should adopt a clearer position on the situation of the hundreds of thousands of ethnic Russians who were permanent residents of Estonia and Latvia, where the "civilized expulsion" of persons who were not part of the indigenous population was being pursued through legislative provisions and the creation of a certain psychological climate by the mass media. Ethnic Russians continued to be discriminated against on the basis of their ethnic identity.

It was a matter of concern that Estonia and Latvia were adopting laws that ignored existing realities and the opinion of international institutes

(Mr. Gorelik, Russian Federation)

and experts. Declaring a third of the population of Estonia aliens or stateless persons and the proposed granting of citizenship to only a fourth of the approximately 800,000 non-nationals in Latvia were serious factors for instability in the region. The Russian Federation, which was sincerely concerned about the fate of democracy in both Estonia and Latvia as well as in Russia itself, would continue to strive to ensure observance of the human rights of ethnic Russians in those countries. The struggle for democracy included measures to combat racism, racial discrimination and other manifestations of intolerance, particularly aggressive nationalism. The consistent pursuit of that effort on a basis agreed upon within the United Nations was one of Russia's priorities.

Mrs. KABA (Observer for Côte d'Ivoire) asked the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights what measures were contemplated in order to avoid duplication of efforts by thematic special rapporteurs, special rapporteurs and representatives. She wondered whether consideration was given to how countries might react when they were the focus of a number of investigations at the same time. As the dates of the 1995 sessions of the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women would overlap significantly, she wondered if the session of the Commission on the Human Rights could be postponed in order to facilitate the task of delegations participating in both bodies.

Mr. FALL (Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights) stressed the significance of the question raised by the representative of Côte d'Ivoire concerning the rationalization of the work of the Commission on the Human Rights. A number of measures had been taken to avoid duplication of efforts by the various special rapporteurs and representatives. Thematic reports were scheduled so as not to coincide with missions by country rapporteurs. Thematic and country special rapporteurs investigating the same country were requested to coordinate their substantive activities and to ensure that the information contained in their reports was complementary. An effort was being made to facilitate the flow of information in general between thematic and country rapporteurs. Thematic and country rapporteurs investigating the same country were also encouraged to conduct joint missions in order to maintain a focused United Nations presence in that country. In accordance with the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, the first meeting of all country and thematic rapporteurs had been held at the end of April in order to improve coordination of their activities. Such meetings would take place annually.

The sessions of the Commission on Human Rights and the Commission on the Status of Women would overlap by only one week. Perhaps issues relating to women could be considered by the Commission on Human Rights during the week

(Mr. Fall)

that did not coincide with the session of the Commission on the Status of Women.

Mrs. HORIUCHI (Japan) expressed satisfaction for the briefing session which the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights had held with all regional groups the week before and said she hoped that the High Commissioner would continue to conduct similar briefings for Member States from time to time. Her delegation welcomed the High Commissioner's efforts to improve coordination of United Nations system-wide activities in the field of human rights, particularly through the Administrative Committee on Coordination (ACC). The human rights protection mechanism of the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) and the Commission of Experts on the situation in Rwanda established by Security Council resolution 935 (1994) proved that such coordination was essential. Greater cooperation and coordination were still necessary, however, particularly between the Commission on Human Rights and the Security Council.

Her delegation welcomed the meeting of special rapporteurs, experts and chairpersons of working groups of the Commission on Human Rights convened by the High Commissioner and hoped that further efforts of that kind would be made. It also welcomed the dialogue the High Commissioner had initiated with Governments and the visits he had made to a number of countries in that connection. At the moment, the High Commissioner was in Japan, where he had met with a number of ministers and high-level government officials. Her delegation agreed that adequate funding and personnel must be provided to him urgently.

The appalling mass exodus from Rwanda to Zaire must be addressed by the international community without delay. Her delegation was encouraged that the Special Rapporteur for Rwanda had visited Rwanda recently and had submitted his report in a timely fashion. It was also pleased that, on the basis of that report, a field officer from the Centre for Human Rights had been dispatched to observe the human rights situation in Rwanda. Her delegation hoped that the recommendations contained in the Special Rapporteur's report would be given urgent attention by the parties to the conflict.

Mr. STREJCZEK (Poland) stressed the need to support new and existing mechanisms of the Commission on Human Rights, including the working groups on human rights defenders and the open-ended working group on the elaboration of a draft optional protocol to the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The fiftieth session of the Commission had confirmed, once again, the vital role played by that body. Positive developments in certain countries must not obscure the tragedies taking place in others, particularly in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Rwanda.

(Mr. Streiczek, Poland)

Poland had responded positively to the High Commissioner's appeal to convene a special session of the Commission on the situation in Rwanda. It endorsed the resolution adopted by the special session and welcomed the action taken by the High Commissioner in that context. The United Nations must reassess its response in such situations. His delegation supported the High Commissioner's view that preventive action, and, where necessary, determined efforts to restore human rights, should continue to be a primary responsibility of the United Nations. That meant that all relevant activities of the Organization should include a human rights component.

The fiftieth session of the Commission and its report confirmed the widely recognized fact that reform of the Commission was vital. His delegation welcomed the efforts of the Chairman of the Commission to rationalize its work and the establishment of an open-ended working group to that end. It hoped that the working group would take a gradual approach to adapting the Commission's agenda and methods of work to current and future needs. The reclustering of agenda items during the fiftieth session of the Commission and improvements in its methods of work, as described by the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights, represented a first step in that direction.

Mr. SREENIVASAN (India) noted that, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 48/141, the High Commissioner for Human Rights was to report annually on his activities to the Commission on Human Rights and, through the Economic and Social Council, to the General Assembly. That reporting procedure had been very carefully negotiated in the open-ended working group of the third Committee and his delegation hoped that it would be followed as closely as possible. His delegation was pleased that the High Commissioner had begun to set policy directives for the Centre for Human Rights and that he was attempting to preserve the spirit of the Vienna Conference by taking a global approach which stressed cooperation and consensus. His initiative to coordinate the human rights activities of the United Nations system and to bring together the special rapporteurs, experts and chairpersons of working groups of the Commission deserved support.

His delegation welcomed, in particular, the fact that the High Commissioner attached great importance to the promotion and protection of the right to development and to enhancing the work of the relevant bodies of the United Nations system in support of that right. In that connection, more effective ways of protecting economic, social and cultural rights must be found. His delegation hoped that the High Commissioner, together with the specialized agencies and international development and financial institutions,

(Mr. Sreenivasan, India)

would consider practical projects for the implementation of the right to development in all its aspects.

The action taken by the High Commissioner had helped to focus world attention on the situations in Burundi and Rwanda. In that connection, his delegation, too, wished to reaffirm that the restoration of peace and security fell within the competence of the Security Council.

Referring to paragraph 3 (a) of General Assembly resolution 48/141, he stressed that the High Commissioner was required to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity and domestic jurisdiction of States and, thus, to engage in activities only at the request or with the consent of the country concerned. He noted that the Vienna Declaration described terrorism as an activity aimed at the destruction of human rights, fundamental freedoms and democracy, threatening territorial integrity, security of States and destabilizing legitimately constituted Governments and that it urged the international community to take the necessary steps to enhance cooperation to prevent and combat terrorism (A/CONF.157/24 (Part I), para. 17). The post of High Commissioner had been established by the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly on the express understanding that it would not become politicized, as had long been feared. In particular, resolution 48/141 indicated that the High Commissioner would perform his duties in an impartial, objective, non-selective and effective manner [para. 2 (a)]. Certain Member States seemed tempted to destroy the spirit of the Vienna Conference by seeking to involve the High Commissioner in political issues. His delegation commended the High Commissioner for resisting such efforts.

Mr. KUEHL (United States of America) said that 20 July had marked the fifth anniversary of the house arrest of Nobel Peace Prize laureate Daw Aung San Suu Ky. of Myanmar, to whom he wished to pay tribute. His delegation urged all Member States to work for her release and for the establishment of democratic institutions in her country.

The presentation by the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights and the report on the special session on Rwanda once again underscored the Commission's growing and complex mandate. Its vital mechanisms must be strengthened by giving its rapporteurs and working groups adequate resources to carry out their tasks. His delegation urged country and thematic special rapporteurs to coordinate their activities. For example, where appropriate, thematic special rapporteurs might accompany country rapporteurs on their visits.

His delegation strongly supported the appeal contained in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action to increase the resources available to the United Nations Centre for Human Rights. Both the Centre and the newly

(Mr. Kuehl, United States)

established Office of the High Commissioner were facing serious budgetary problems. The High Commissioner, who had made an impressive start, must have sufficient resources to travel, including in response to emergency situations such as the situation in Rwanda. His delegation therefore fully supported the High Commissioner's request for additional funding and personnel. A concerted effort must be made to increase the resources allocated to both the Centre and the High Commissioner within the context of zero real growth of the budget. In any case, priority must be accorded to human rights.

Those who had committed genocide and other atrocities in Rwanda must be held accountable. Implementation of human rights standards must be an integral part of every United Nations action taken with respect to Rwanda. His Government accorded the highest priority to responding quickly and comprehensively to the Secretary-General's consolidated appeal for humanitarian assistance for Rwanda. The United States was sharply increasing its assistance, both through funding and through the provision of both equipment and personnel. Since April 1994, it had contributed over \$120 million to the Rwandan relief effort.

Mrs. ARIAS (Colombia) said that her delegation welcomed the coordination between the activities of the Centre for Human Rights and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in the spirit of General Assembly 48/141. It hoped that the Office of the High Commissioner would be strengthened during the forty-ninth session so that it would be able to carry out its work without problems or financial constraints. Referring to the presentation by the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights, she said that the Commission's efficiency and effectiveness should not be judged by the number of resolutions and decisions it adopted. On the contrary, it should attempt to limit that number. Her delegation therefore viewed with great interest the establishment of an open-ended working group on the rationalization of the work of the Commission. It also looked forward to the meetings of the open-ended working group of the third Committee, as there was a need to rationalize not only the work of the Commission on Human Rights but also the human rights activities of the United Nations system as a whole.

Her delegation welcomed the establishment by the Commission of an open-ended inter-sessional working group responsible for elaborating guidelines for a possible draft optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography. The activities carried out by the Commission in order to ensure the realization of the right to development and of economic, social and cultural rights were to be commended. Her delegation hoped that those

(Mrs. Arias, Colombia)

activities would continue and that they would be supported by the Centre for Human Rights. It agreed with the Assistant Secretary-General's remarks concerning universal ratification of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which should complement the activities of the Centre for Human Rights in that area. Her delegation urged all States which had not yet done so to ratify the Convention.

With regard to the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, her delegation took note of the report of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia. Referring to the very clear mandate set forth in resolution 1993/20 of the Commission on Human Rights, she expressed concern that the work of the Special Rapporteur might lose its focus if he tried to cover too much ground. Deeply concerned about the incidents of racism, xenophobia and racial discrimination in a number of Western European countries, her delegation would continue to participate in all activities aimed at eliminating them.

Lastly, referring to resolution 1994/56 on the composition of the staff of the Centre for Human Rights, she inquired about the report on the current geographical distribution of posts in the Centre, which the Secretary-General had been requested to present to the Fifth Committee of the General Assembly through the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. FALL (Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights) said that that report in question would be available in one week.

Mr. FERNANDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) said that his delegation wished to highlight several points contained in the report of the Commission on Human Rights on its fiftieth session. Cuba welcomed the adoption of resolution 1994/64 concerning measures to combat contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, but was dismayed that, as mentioned in paragraph 10, the Special Rapporteur was still encountering difficulties owing to insufficient resources and the failure of Governments to cooperate with him. Cuba was particularly concerned by recent instances of xenophobic violence in certain countries of the European Union and encouraged the Commission to take definite action to combat that problem.

Unfortunately, despite the consensus achieved at the Vienna Conference, the fiftieth session of the Commission had witnessed the reopening of debates on a number of topics. Many resolutions had been put to a vote despite the fact that they embodied the concerns of an immense majority of Commission members, example, resolution 1994/47 condemning the United States embargo against Cuba, which represented a systematic violation of the human rights of millions.

(Mr. Fernandez Palacios, Cuba)

Cuba endorsed resolutions 1994/90 and 1994/92 concerning the rights of the child. The increase in the sale of children, child prostitution and pornography in some countries was unacceptable, and the Special Rapporteur should be given more resources and support from Governments. It supported the recommendation to adopt the draft decision authorizing the establishment of a working group to elaborate guidelines for a draft optional protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child.

With regard to the question of racism and xenophobia, Cuba regretted that the Commission had found it necessary to put to a vote the resolution on the rights of migrant workers. That represented a step backward at a time when the international community was working towards the adoption of the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families. Cuba reaffirmed its commitment to the right to development, as expressed in resolution 1994/21, which again, despite the consensus achieved in Vienna, had been put to a vote.

The High Commissioner for Human Rights should be congratulated for the auspicious start he had made in the performance of his mandate. Cuba supported his steps to consolidate the Centre for Human Rights. Among his priority tasks would be the rationalization of the work of the United Nations in the field of human rights, to avoid duplication of effort and make the fullest use of available resources.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) drew attention to the serious violations of human rights being committed by India against the population in Jammu and Kashmir, which had taken a very heavy toll in human lives and suffering. At the fiftieth session of the Commission on Human Rights, Pakistan had submitted a draft resolution expressing concern about the human rights situation in Jammu and Kashmir and proposing an impartial investigation by a United Nations fact-finding mission. In an attempt to prevent adoption of the draft resolution, India had offered several assurances to the Commission, promising greater transparency and inviting Amnesty International and other human rights organizations to visit the area in the near future. India had also indicated to the Iranian Government that it was willing to allow a group of ambassadors from Islamic countries full access to Indian-held Kashmir if Pakistan did not press its resolution to a vote.

Although the Pakistani delegation had agreed to defer a vote on the draft resolution, Indian officials had then disclaimed their acceptance of a visit from the Organization of the Islamic Conference. Subsequently, a short visit for a mixed group of ambassadors to selected locations had been arranged, but the ambassadors had not been allowed to move freely, nor had they been able to meet with local leaders or visit the sites of recent massacres. Furthermore,

(Mr. Akram, Pakistan)

despite earlier assurances, Amnesty International had not been given permission to visit Indian-held Kashmir. During the single visit of a delegation from the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), its members were given over 5,000 petitions seeking redress for various human rights violations. Furthermore, none of the thematic rapporteurs of the Commission on Human Rights had yet visited Indian-held Kashmir. According to recent reports, abuses by the Indian army against the people of the area were continuing with impunity.

India had deployed 600,000 troops in Kashmir, the heaviest concentration of troops in the history of colonial occupation. The level of violence was thus likely to escalate. The world community could no longer remain silent in the face of the grave human rights crisis in Kashmir. An escalation of the conflict could also pose a serious threat to international peace and security. Ending the repression would serve the interests not only of the Kashmiri people but also of Pakistan, India and the world community. It was Pakistan's hope that progress would open the way for a meaningful dialogue between Pakistan and India to promote a just settlement of the Kashmir dispute on the basis of United Nations resolutions and to build a climate of peace and security in South Asia.

Mr. SIDDIG (Observer for the Sudan), referring to the statement made by the representative of Germany on behalf of the European Union, said that the Government of the Sudan had indicated its readiness to receive the Special Rapporteur and had extended its full cooperation, as the Special Rapporteur himself had stated in his report. Unfortunately, however, the Special Rapporteur had exceeded his mandate, which did not give him the right to criticize Islam or to become involved in several forums sponsored by the political opposition. Such actions negated his neutrality.

Most of the allegations of human rights abuses were connected with the armed conflict in southern Sudan. He informed the Council that a cease-fire would begin at that night at midnight to help ensure the success of the Nairobi peace talks. His delegation appealed for a clear definition of the mandate of special rapporteurs and representatives and a specific description of their responsibilities and powers.

Mr. ALI (Observer for Iraq) said that the statement made by the representative of Germany on behalf of the European Union had reflected a double standard and a selective approach. The statement had contained no mention of the human rights violations taking place in countries of the European Union.

As for the situation of human rights in Iraq, the representative of Germany should have raised the issue of the violation by some countries of the

(Mr. Ali)

human rights of Iraqi citizens through the embargo, which deprived them of the right to food and medicine. Over 200,000 Iraqi children had died since the siege began.

Mr. GULEV (Ukraine) said that the condemnation of ethnic cleansing as practised in the territory of the former Yugoslavia should also apply to all manifestations of racism and racial discrimination, wherever they took place. His delegation therefore welcomed the establishment of a tribunal to prosecute violations of humanitarian law taking place in the former Yugoslavia.

His delegation supported the work of the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance. It was interesting to note that resolution 1994/64 of the Commission on Human Rights was the first resolution which officially condemned anti-Semitism. Ukraine joined in the call for universal accession to the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racism and Racial Discrimination.

His delegation commended efforts to rationalize the work of the Commission on Human Rights. The Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, a unique expert body, required major changes in its procedures, however, because its activities overlapped with those of the Commission itself and it had a tendency to politicize issues. The international legal instruments for the protection of minorities must be enhanced. Ukraine fully supported the establishment of the inter-sessional working groups on new human rights instruments and on the optional protocols to the Convention on the Rights of the Child. Ukraine hoped that, in future, the Commission would take steps to strengthen the internal stability of newly independent States that were in transition to democracy and a market economy.

Mr. LUEDIG (Observer for Estonia) said that his delegation hoped that the information which the High Commissioner for Human Rights would gather on his forthcoming visit to Estonia and the Baltic States would be useful. The accusations made by the Russian Federation regarding the situation of human rights in Estonia were unfounded. The facts did not support the allegation that attempts were being made to create a mono-ethnic state. No expulsions of Russian-speaking people were taking place. On the contrary, the Estonian Government was taking legal and practical steps to create a climate of inclusiveness in Estonia.

His delegation agreed that the policies and actions of Governments should be judged in the light of accepted human rights principles and standards in order to determine whether abuses were taking place. It did not support

(Mr. Luedig)

politically-founded, situational and deconstructivist standards of what constituted human rights and their abuse.

His delegation welcomed the emphasis placed on human rights education and looked forward to the development of a plan for a United Nations decade for human rights education. Individuals as well as communities must become better informed about the subject, and the High Commissioner should present his findings to the various communities involved with specific questions of human rights, in order to educate them. A clear explanation of the rights and obligations of all parties to a dispute over human rights abuse would encourage constructive dialogue.

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.



Economic and Social
Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1994/SR.42
25 January 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Substantive session of 1994

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 42nd MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 22 July 1994, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. DANGUE REWAKA
(Vice-President)

(Gabon)

CONTENTS

SOCIAL, HUMANITARIAN AND HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY
BODIES, CONFERENCES AND RELATED QUESTIONS (continued)

- (b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE THIRD DECADE TO
COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued)
- (c) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO
COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE
INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS
(continued)
- (d) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working
languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in
a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this
document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference
Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 3.30 p.m.

In the absence of Mr. Butler (President), M. Dangué Kewaka (Gabon), Vice-President, took the chair.

SOCIAL, HUMANITARIAN AND HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY BODIES, CONFERENCES AND RELATED QUESTIONS (continued)

- (b) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME OF ACTION FOR THE THIRD DECADE TO COMBAT RACISM AND RACIAL DISCRIMINATION (continued) (E/1994/78, E/1994/97)
- (c) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (A/49/216, A/49/263-E/1994/112, E/1994/114, E/1994/96)
- (d) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued) (A/49/41, A/49/261-E/1994/110, A/49/264-E/1994/113, A/49/270-E/1994/116, E/1994/5, E/1994/23, E/1994/24, E/1994/63, E/1994/76 and Add.1, E/1994/106, E/1994/107; E/1994/L.13, L.15, L.26; E/1994/NGO/6)

Mr. SLOKENBERGS (Observer for Latvia) said that his Government looked forward to the visit to Latvia and other countries in the Baltic Sea region by the High Commissioner for Human Rights in August 1994. Its invitation to the High Commissioner was consistent with its policy of openness, whereby its transition to democracy and a market economy and its ongoing process of restoration of its independence had been opened to the world for inspection.

Referring to the comment made at the previous meeting by the representative of the Russian Federation to the effect that Latvia was seeking to develop a "mono-ethnic" State, he said that that statement did not coincide with reality. Latvia had already been a multicultural society in 1940 when it had been occupied and illegally annexed by the Soviet Union. Since regaining its independence in 1991, Latvia had continued to be a polyethnic society, as evidenced by the approximately 400,000 non-ethnic Latvians who were currently citizens of Latvia.

Latvia was striving to integrate the populations that had been transferred into its territory by the Soviet occupation regime. A significant step had been taken earlier that day, when the Parliament of Latvia had adopted the law on citizenship. Although citizenship laws as such were an internal matter for States, in developing that legislation the Parliament of Latvia had had close consultations with regional organizations, in particular the Council of Europe and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The law was in full conformity with the standards advocated by those organizations.

Many unsubstantiated accusations and much colourful rhetoric had been heard from the representative of the Russian Federation. No expulsions were taking place, nor would persons applying for citizenship ever be judged on the basis of ethnicity. It was intriguing that the Russian delegation placed such

/...

(Mr. Slokenbergs)

focus on two small peaceful nations, Estonia and Latvia, and said nothing about the armed conflicts involving death, destruction, displacement and gross human rights violations which were raging in several areas in the former Soviet Union. It was perhaps not a debate about human rights at all.

Mr. ELIASSON (Observer for Sweden) said that his delegation attached great importance to the Daw Aung San Suu Kyi case. It had therefore issued a national statement, and had also joined the European Union, Austria, Finland and Norway in issuing a joint statement on the fifth anniversary of her detention.

Mrs. LATERZA (Paraguay) said that her delegation was pleased that the Commission on Human Rights was now considering cases of human rights violations in all continents and political systems, as a result of the new climate prevailing in international relations. There was no doubt that the procedures and mechanisms could be improved, but that should be done within the existing forums the Commission itself, the Council, and the General Assembly and under the rules of the Organization. Meanwhile, the Commission needed to accord greater attention to the new aspects of the protection of human rights relating to basic needs and decent standards of living.

Mr. LEE (Republic of Korea) said that the special rapporteurs, special representatives and independent experts of the Commission on Human Rights played a crucial role; many had reported serious human rights violations taking place around the world. He commended those Governments, including the Government of Myanmar, which had cooperated with the special rapporteurs by allowing them to make fact-finding visits. It was regrettable that other countries were continuing to reject fact-finding missions and that many Governments had failed to comply with the recommendations of the special rapporteurs. Without the full cooperation of the Government concerned, the Commission could not achieve its goals.

One of the most urgent tasks of the Commission was to rationalize its agenda; his delegation hoped that the open-ended working group established under decision 1994/111 would develop a balanced agenda for the fifty-first session of the Commission.

Ms. SAPCANIN (Observer for Bosnia and Herzegovina) said that her delegation sought clarification as to whether the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the territory of the former Yugoslavia would be presenting a report to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session. Her delegation had raised the issue in the Third Committee because the Special Rapporteur had been absent at the forty-eighth session. Her delegation commended the Special Rapporteur's efforts; according to his reports and those of various human rights organizations, grave violations of human rights were

/...

(Ms. Sapcanin)

being perpetrated by the Serbian forces against the non-Serbian population of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Those violations had intensified.

Mr. AL-MUAKKAF (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) said that his delegation wished to draw attention to the sufferings of the Libyan people; Libyan children and women were being deprived of vaccines and medicines and the entire population was suffering from shortage of foodstuffs. Many people, unable to go abroad for treatment because of the embargo, had died. The suffering of the people was increasing daily. His delegation therefore called on the Council to lift the sanctions so that the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya could pursue its economic and social development and promote prosperity for its people.

Mr. GHAFUORZAI (Observer for Afghanistan) said that his delegation had a special interest in the work of the Commission on Human Rights relating to the situation of human rights in Afghanistan. He expressed appreciation for the efforts of the Special Rapporteur and the useful services he had rendered. During the year under review his Government had continued to cooperate with the Special Rapporteur and assist him in the discharge of his mandate. That was reflected in the report and in resolution 1994/84 of the Commission on Human Rights.

Political life in Afghanistan, after 14 years of war entailing enormous sacrifices, had entered a transitional period following the collapse of the communist regime and the establishment of an Islamic State in April 1992. Afghanistan needed assistance from the international community in order to move successfully through the transitional period and establish peace and stability and a political process based on the free exercise of the right of self-determination, including free and general elections with the objective of the full enjoyment of fundamental rights and freedoms by all Afghans.

The fifteenth preambular paragraph of resolution 1994/84, concerning the decline in the repatriation of Afghan refugees, did not correspond to the actual situation; repatriation had been slowed down by the fact that over 10 million land mines remained in Afghanistan. Paragraph 11 referred to «prisoners of war and persons missing as a result of war in Afghanistan» but made no reference to the aggression against Afghanistan. In paragraph 26, the human rights situation in Afghanistan was wrongly linked with the question of colonial and other dependent countries and territories. That reference was an affront to the sovereignty and political independence of Afghanistan. The world community was aware that Afghanistan had paid 1.7 million lives for its freedom in order to avoid becoming a colonial territory. It was not clear whether the concept had been included inadvertently or was a product of

(Mr. Gharfoorzai)

lobbying by those who wished to see Afghanistan become a colony but had failed.

Ms. FERTEKLIGIL (Observer for Turkey), referring to resolution 1994/64 of the Commission on Human Rights entitled «Measures to combat contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance», said that the new forms of racism and racial discrimination were among the most serious problems to be solved in the context of the struggle against human rights violations in modern societies. Racist incidents were continuing to occur, especially in developed countries, and innocent people were its victims. The increasing circulation of persons of different cultures, civilizations and religions could only aggravate the problem by giving racist movements new targets for their attacks; it was therefore necessary to be more vigilant than ever before against such movements.

Migrant workers were one of the groups most threatened by the new forms of racism, although they contributed to the economic development of the countries where they lived and fulfilled all their obligations to the host country. They often faced all kinds of insults and attacks by racist groups, and even threats to their lives. Therefore, in addition to measures to protect persons threatened by such acts, it was absolutely necessary to implement anti-racist policies which would strengthen cultural pluralism and social harmony.

Turkey believed that it was very important to give all necessary assistance to the Special Rapporteur on contemporary forms of racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance and supported his proposal to organize an interdisciplinary seminar. It hoped that Member States and the Secretariat would provide organizational and budgetary support for the seminar, which would be very useful in the context of the Programme of Action for the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination.

On resolution 1994/46, entitled «Human rights and terrorism», she said that terrorism was one of the great scourges of the century, causing flagrant violations of human rights in a growing number of countries. Turkey condemned all terrorist acts, practices and methods. It was very concerned about the increasing number of innocent victims and believed that unequivocal condemnation of terrorism by the international community and a strengthening of cooperation in the fight against terrorism at all levels national, regional and international was more necessary than ever before to resolve that grave problem.

Mr. RUEHL (United States of America) said that he supported the request made by the representative of Bosnia and Herzegovina; it was his delegation's understanding that the Special Rapporteur on the situation of

(Mr. Ruehl)

human rights in the territory of the former Yugoslavia was supposed to deliver his report in person to the Third Committee.

Mr. FALL (Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights) said that the Special Rapporteur had not submitted a report to the General Assembly in 1993 because the relevant resolution of the Commission on Human rights had not mentioned that obligation; the obligation had been mentioned in the 1992 resolution and again in resolution 1994/72, paragraph 37 of which requested the Special Rapporteur to submit periodic reports to the Commission and the General Assembly and also requested the Secretary-General to continue to make the Special Rapporteur's reports available to the Security Council.

The PRESIDENT said that he had received a request from two non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to address the Council under sub-item 5 (d). It would be recalled that the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, in conformity with resolution 1296 (XLIV) of the Council and article 84 of its rules of procedure, had recommended that the Council should hear a certain number of NGOs under specific agenda items. Furthermore, at its 32nd meeting, the Council had approved the requests for hearings by the NGOs listed in document E/1994/89 as well as a request from the World Muslim Congress to be heard under agenda item 5 (d).

Ms. MANIMEKALAI (India), speaking on a point of order, said that her delegation had strong reservations regarding the participation of the world Muslim Congress on two grounds: first, the World Muslim Congress had a history of attacks against India on specious grounds, and second, its participation had not been approved through the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations under the normal procedure, and no corrigendum to the list of participating NGOs had been issued.

Mr. SAFI (World Muslim Congress) said that he was the General Secretary of the Jammu and Kashmir All Parties Hurriyat Conference, the umbrella organization for thirty-four Kashmiri political parties and groups representing the entire spectrum of Kashmiri opinion. Kashmir had been under Indian rule for 46 years while awaiting fulfillment of the promise made by the United Nations, India and Pakistan. The Security Council had clearly mandated that the final disposition of Jammu and Kashmir would be determined in accordance with the wishes of the people expressed through an impartial plebiscite under the auspices of the United Nations. After 46 years, that pledge remained unfulfilled. The Indian occupation continued and the Indian authorities continued to brutalize the people of Jammu and Kashmir.

For the people of Kashmir, Indian occupation had been an experience of pain, humiliation and suffering beyond endurance. However, they had continued their peaceful struggle to seek the implementation of United Nations

(Mr. Safi)

resolutions. In November 1989, India had tried to stage State-managed elections; the Kashmiris had once again rejected that hoax. It was widely documented that less than 3 per cent of Kashmiris, mostly Indians forced upon Kashmiri soil, had participated in those elections. The Kashmiris had started organizing peaceful demonstrations against the Indian occupation.

Mr. SREENI/ASAN (India), speaking on a point of order, asked under which agenda item the representative of the World Muslim Congress was speaking. It had been made clear that representatives of NGOs must speak about specific items that were before the Council.

The PRESIDENT said that he assumed that the representative of the World Muslim Congress was speaking under item 5. He requested him to concentrate on specific action to be taken, as required by the rules of the Council.

Mr. SAFI (World Muslim Congress) said that in January 1990, 150 peaceful marchers had been gunned down. Since then, India had considerably escalated its repression. Its forces of over 600,000 had tried to stifle the Kashmiri movement in the harshest way imaginable; to date they had killed over 40,000 Kashmiris, tortured and maimed thousands, raped over 5,000 women, burned down \$400 million worth of personal and commercial property and held 50,000 Kashmiris in torture camps. The Kashmiri political leadership was being systematically eliminated. Some were languishing in jail; others had been assassinated by Indian agents.

Mr. SREENIVASAN (India), speaking on a point of order, said that the President had said that speakers before the Council should confine themselves to the resolutions and decisions that had been before the Commission on Human Rights. There was no resolution about India. He therefore requested the President to rule that the representative of the World Muslim Congress was out of order.

The PRESIDENT said that he wished to remind representatives of NGOs to refrain from making general statements and to confine themselves to decisions of the Council. He requested the representative of the World Muslim Congress to concentrate on action to be taken.

Mr. SAFI (World Muslim Congress) said that Kashmir was under Indian military occupation; half a million Indian soldiers were brutalizing the Kashmir valley. It was ruled by an Indian general, under emergency laws which encouraged murder, torture and rape; no Indian soldier feared punishment for such crimes.

Mr. SREENIVASAN (India), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, said that the World Muslim Congress, which was based in Karachi, would have done well to throw light on the human rights violations occurring in the city

(Mr. Sreenivasan, India)

where it was based. His delegation would, however, reply directly to the country for which the World Muslim Congress acted as proxy. As had been demonstrated in the Council's 43rd meeting, Pakistan was seeking to pursue its political agenda in the guise of a discussion of human rights. At the fiftieth session of the Commission on Human Rights, it had attempted to obtain a resolution condemning India, but had been forced to withdraw it for lack of support. India had made no commitments in connection with that resolution or its withdrawal and made no distinction on the basis of religion with respect either to its own citizens or to ambassadors of foreign countries. The core of the problem was Pakistan's promotion of terrorism in neighbouring Indian states, about which Pakistan openly boasted. A fact sheet recently published in Pakistan had drawn attention to the sharp deterioration of the human rights situation in that country over the past nine months. Before talking about human rights violations in India, Pakistan should first practice the virtues it pretended to preach.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that his delegation had raised the Kashmir issue in the Council because that issue had figured prominently in the fiftieth session of the Commission on Human Rights. Moreover, although India might deny that it had made any commitments on the subject when Pakistan had agreed to withdraw its draft resolution in the Commission on Human Rights, the representative of Iran had referred to that commitment, and to India's agreement to receive a group of Islamic ambassadors, in a statement made in the Commission. If India had nothing to hide it would allow access to Kashmir by the international human rights and other organizations which had requested it. It had refused to do so because massive repression was in fact taking place there.

The Indian representative had referred to terrorism, but the fact was that India had promoted terrorism in Sri Lanka and Pakistan, had directed constant broadcasts to Sind promoting secession there and had instigated and supported extremists groups in Karachi. The press in Pakistan was free and did not practice the self-censorship of the Indian media. What Pakistan asked of India was that it should withdraw its army from Kashmir. Kashmir was not a part of India, it was a disputed territory whose future must be decided according to the wishes of its population expressed in a free and impartial plebiscite.

Mr. SREENIVASAN (India) said that the representative of Pakistan was not discussing a human rights question but pursuing its political and territorial ambitions. The report of the Commission on Human Rights, in summarizing the Commission's action on the question, made no reference to any

(Mr. Sreenivasan, India)

understanding reached with India. No matter what Pakistan did or tried to do, Kashmir was a part of India and would remain so forever.

Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan) said that the people of Kashmir hated and rejected India, as the Council had just been able to hear for itself. What India was doing in Kashmir was carrying out a brutal and naked repression of its people.

Mrs. von ROEMER [International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU)] said that her organization, which had been involved from the outset in the long struggle for the creation of the post of High Commissioner for Human Rights, listened to his address and studied the report on his initial activities with great interest. As the High Commissioner had pointed out, his mandate included the responsibility of engaging in a dialogue with all Governments with a view to securing respect for all human rights. The ICFTU had therefore welcomed the increased attention paid to economic, social and cultural rights by the Commission on Human Rights. It was a sad fact, however, that the people who fought for those rights were among those most likely to be subjected to violations of their civil and political rights. Greater attention to economic, social and cultural rights therefore implied greater attention to the rights of those who struggled for their realization. In all too many countries, being a trade unionist was still a very dangerous occupation. Men and women were murdered, tortured, forced into exile, imprisoned, harassed or dismissed simply for defending legitimate and internationally recognized workers' rights. The latest ICFTU survey of violations of trade union rights showed that 92 trade unionists had been murdered in the past year in 14 countries.

The ICFTU commended the Commission on Human Rights for addressing that situation in its resolution 1994/63. It would wish to see more attention to the violations of trade union rights in the reports of the various Special Rapporteurs and hoped that the High Commissioner, in collaboration with the ILO, would use his moral authority to ensure respect for the fundamental rights of workers as enshrined in both human rights and ILO conventions. That would further the realization of the right to development as well as the cause of peace.

The PRESIDENT proposed that the letter from the Chairman of the Commission on Human rights addressed to the President of the Council should be taken up when the Council considered programme questions, and that the Council should take note of the other reports submitted to it under sub-item (d).

It was so decided.

Action on recommendations contained in the report of the Commission on Human Rights (E/1994/24 and E/1994/L.15)

Draft resolutions I and II

Draft resolutions I and II were adopted.

Mr. RUEHL (United States of America) noted that his delegation had not participated in the discussion of the resolution referred to in draft resolution II.

Draft resolutions III and IV

Draft resolutions III and IV were adopted.

Draft decision 1

Draft decision 1 was adopted.

Mr. MUCH (Germany) said that draft decision 1 addressed an issue whose importance could not be overestimated, that of the transition to democracy in South Africa. The European Community called on all parties to leave violence behind and to help further that transition. The European Union had undertaken to provide a package of economic measures to help South Africa and to intensify a political dialogue intended to consolidate democratic institutions in that country.

Draft decisions 2 and 3

Draft decisions 2 and 3 were adopted.

Draft decision 4

At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on the draft decision.

In favor: Angola, Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, France, Gabon, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Against: Japan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Belarus, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Greece, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Russian Federation

Draft decision 4 was adopted by 38 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions.

Mr. CRAPATURNEANU (Romania), speaking in explanation of vote, said that there was a strong interrelationship between democracy and human rights. It was important to take into account the consensus language reflected in the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action. Moreover, since the individual was the subject of the development process, it was appropriate to use expressions such as "human sustainable development".

Although his delegation had voted in favour of the draft decision, it shared the opinion of other delegations that portions of the text could be improved. It hoped that the Working Group could identify common agreed-upon language in order to eliminate the issues that had impeded adoption by consensus.

Mr. BIGGAR (Ireland) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the proposal because it strongly supported the right to development, on which consensus language had been agreed at the World Conference on Human Rights in Vienna. Implementation of the right to development should be considered in the Working Group. His delegation trusted that the procedural matters set out in Commission on Human Rights resolution 1994/21 on "The right to development", particularly regarding the joint consultative meeting of the members of the Working Group and the Chairpersons of the treaty bodies, and the participation of the regional economic commissions and the heads of international financial institutions, would contribute to a full and fruitful consideration of the matter.

His delegation noted with regret that resolution 1994/21 contained a number of elements which departed from the consensus achieved in Vienna and hoped that future changes in wording would bring about consensus on the resolution.

Mrs. HORIUCHI (Japan) said that the consensus reached in Vienna regarding the right to development had been one of the most important outcomes of the World Conference on Human Rights. It was therefore regrettable that the Commission on Human Rights, at its latest session, had not been able to reach a consensus on a resolution on that issue because of some paragraphs, particularly operative paragraphs 2 and 6, which departed from the language used in Vienna.

Mr. MONGBE (Benin) said that the right to development was a fundamental right which had been recognized implicitly in the Rio Declaration and clarified in Vienna. His delegation was therefore troubled to see that that right was not accepted independently of any other considerations. It was not the Economic and Social Council's function to engage in legal hairsplitting. Commitment to peace, sustainable development and human development implied acceptance of the right to development. His delegation hoped that at the Council's next session, the remaining textual difficulties would have been resolved and the draft decision would be adopted by consensus. In fact, however, since development was a fundamental right, a vote should not have been necessary, nor should one have been requested.

Mr. FENN (United Kingdom) said that he supported Benin's position. While the United Kingdom had acknowledged the right to development in the Vienna Declaration and had worked hard in Geneva at the World Conference on Human Rights to achieve a consensus text, it felt that the resulting resolution moved beyond the consensus achieved in Vienna. His delegation had therefore felt compelled to vote against it. The United Kingdom would continue to work towards future consensus.

Mr. RUEHL (United States of America) said that his delegation had stated its position at the World Conference on Human Rights in Geneva and did not mean to explain itself again. However, moved by the words of the representative of Benin, it wished to explain that it had voted not against the right to development, but against a decision and a resolution with whose wording and content it disagreed. His delegation would continue to work towards consensus on the matter.

Draft decision 5

Draft decision 5 was adopted.

Draft decision 6

Draft decision 6 was adopted.

Draft decision 7

Draft decision 7 was adopted.

Draft decision 8

Draft decision 8 was adopted.

Draft decision 9

Mr. FERNANDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) said that draft decision 9 should be modified by inserting the words, «within the framework of the mandate established by the Commission» after the words «by the States concerned» in order to make the draft decision more closely correspond to paragraph 4 of Commission on Human Rights resolution 1994/32.

Mr. FENN (United Kingdom) said that he disagreed not with the substantive point made by the representative of Cuba, but with the implication that mandates resided in the declarations of the Economic and Social Council, which must therefore be elaborated at great length until they so closely resembled the resolutions of the Commission on Human Rights that the latter might as well not exist. If the Working Group was in doubt regarding its mandate, it could refer directly to the relevant Commission on Human Rights resolutions.

Mr. FERNANDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) said that the Economic and Social Council was a principal organ of the United Nations, with the absolute right to change or withdraw any recommendation of a subsidiary organ. He wished only to improve the wording of the Council's decisions and make them correspond to the texts of the resolutions. He suggested that discussion of the matter should continue informally and that the Council should take a decision on the question at the end of the current session.

Mr. RUEHL (United States of America) supported the remarks of the representative of the United Kingdom. The resolutions under consideration had already been adopted by the Commission on Human Rights and had been reviewed by those members of the Commission who were also members of the Economic and Social Council. Cuba had a very able delegation in Geneva and could have proposed revisions in that forum.

Mr. FERNANDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) reminded the representative of the United States that the recommendation in question had been circulated on the last night of the World Conference on Human Rights and that some delegations, however able, had not had time to review them before the close of the Conference.

Mr. MONGBE (Benin) said that the texts of resolutions of subsidiary organs could indeed be revised by the Economic and Social Council. Not all Council members were members of subsidiary bodies, and the Economic and Social Council was not obliged to accept the resolutions of such bodies. It would be preferable for the matter to be taken up in informal discussions at another time.

Ms. FENG Cui (China) said that while resolution 1994/32 had been adopted by the Commission on Human Rights, draft decision 9 should be discussed by the Economic and Social Council. Her delegation supported the amendment proposed by Cuba and felt that it was important to raise the question of the Working Group's mandate. Her delegation hoped that consensus could be achieved on the matter.

Consideration of draft decision 9 was postponed.

Draft decision 10

Draft decision 10 was adopted.

Draft decision 11

Draft decision 11 was adopted.

Draft decision 12

Draft decision 12 was adopted.

Draft decision 13

Draft decision 13 was adopted.

Draft decision 14

Draft decision 14 was adopted.

Draft decision 15

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that her delegation was interested in the proclamation of a decade for human rights education. The High Commissioner for Human Rights had stressed the importance of education and information in the long-term strategy for improving respect for human rights throughout the world; that had also been recognized at the World Conference on Human Rights. She hoped that draft decision 15 would be adopted without a vote.

Draft decision 15 was adopted.

Draft decision 16

Draft decision 16 was adopted.

Draft decision 17

Draft decision 17 was adopted.

Mr. MUCH (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, welcomed the signing of the Comprehensive Agreement on Human Rights and the agreements between the Government of Guatemala and the Unidad Revolucionaria Nacional Guatemalteca (URNG) on the repatriation of refugees and displaced persons and on the setting up of a committee of inquiry into past events. The European Union, which supported the efforts by President Ramiro de León Carpio to promote peace, respect for human rights and democratic reforms, trusted that those agreements would form the basis for a lasting peace in Guatemala. It hoped that the Government of Guatemala would take full advantage of the services of the independent expert of the Commission on Human Rights and that a United Nations human rights monitoring mission would be deployed soon.

Draft decision 18

Draft decision 18 was adopted.

Draft decision 19

Draft decision 19 was adopted.

Draft decision 20

Draft decision 20 was adopted.

Draft decision 21

Mr. FERNANDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) said that Cuba did not recognize the decision by the Commission because it was the result of a discriminatory process dominated by the particular interests of the United States in maintaining Cuba under international scrutiny. The United States was not in a position to teach other nations about human rights because it had not only financed and supported oppressive regimes throughout the world but had also carried out wars of aggression and invaded, and occupied other countries in violation of international law. It had also failed to respect the needs of its own ethnic minorities and had tried for 30 years, through a brutal economic blockade, to owe the Cuban people to their knees. Cuba would never reject any dialogue and cooperation based on respect for the principles of sovereign equality. As it had nothing to hide, the Government of Cuba had decided to invite High Commissioner for Human Rights to visit the country and to observe the situation at first hand. That invitation was a genuine expression of the Government's desire to cooperate in the area of human rights.

At the request of the representative of Cuba, a recorded vote was taken on the draft decision.

In favor: Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Against: Angola, China, Cuba, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, United Republic of Tanzania

Abstaining: Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belarus, Brazil, Colombia, Egypt, Gabon, Mexico, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Ukraine, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Draft decision 2 was adopted by 24 votes to 8, with 14 abstentions.

Mr. MUCH (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union had supported the decision in order to express its deep concern over reports of violations of human rights in Cuba and called upon that country to tolerate dissenting opinions from its citizens and to cooperate with the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in Cuba.

Mr. KAREV (Russian Federation) said that his delegation, which had voted in favour of the draft decision, welcomed Cuba's decision to invite the High Commissioner for Human Rights to visit Cuba.

Mr. FERNANDEZ-PALACIOS (Cuba) said that the European Union and its member States, where many of the manifestations of racism, racial discrimination and xenophobia were rampant, were not in a position to give Cuba any lectures on human rights.

Draft decision 22

Draft decision 22 was adopted.

Draft decision 23

Mr. ISSA (Egypt) said that his country had reservations about paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of the draft decision on criteria for establishing justice which should be applied within the context of full respect for the cultural, religious and social customs in the society concerned. Matters such as full respect for the freedom of expression should not imply any lack of respect for religious, social and cultural values.

Draft decision 23 was adopted.

Mr. REZVANI (Observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran) said that his delegation dissociated itself from the draft decision, which reflected neither the actual situation of human rights in his country nor the spirit of cooperation extended by his country to the Commission on Human Rights.

Ms. FENG Cui (China) said that her delegation dissociated itself from the draft decision.

Mr. MUCH (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union would have voted in favour of the draft decision because of its deep concern over continued reports of serious human rights violations and called upon the Government of Iran to cooperate with the Special Rapporteur so that he could fulfill his mandate. Iran should not only initiate a complete and thorough investigation of the murders in 1994 of two Christian priests and a bishop but should also take the necessary measures to protect citizens of all faiths.

Mr. AL-MUAKKAF (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), together with Mr. AL-SAEID (Kuwait), Mr. AKRAM (Pakistan), Mr. MOMEN (Bangladesh), Mr. FERNANDEZ-PALACIOS (Cuba), Mr. SUTOYO (Indonesia), Ms. MURUGESAN (India) and Mrs. MSUYA (United Republic of Tanzania), said that had the draft decision been put to the vote, they would have voted against it.

The meeting rose at 6.15 p.m.



Economic and Social
Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1994/SR.43
25 janvier 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Substantive session of 1994

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 43rd MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 25 July 1994, at 10 a.m.

President:

Mr. DANGUE REWAKA
(Vice-President)

(Gabon)

CONTENTS

ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY BODIES,
CONFERENCES AND RELATED QUESTIONS (continued)

(b) COOPERATION IN FISHERIES IN AFRICA (continued)

SOCIAL, HUMANITARIAN AND HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY
BODIES, CONFERENCES AND RELATED QUESTIONS (continued)

(i) INTERNATIONAL DECADE FOR NATURAL DISASTER REDUCTION (continued)

(j) CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (continued)

(d) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued)

(g) CRIME PREVENTION AND CAPITAL JUSTICE (continued)

(d) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued)

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

In the absence of the President, Mr. Danque Rewaka (Gabon), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.25 a.m.

ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY BODIES, CONFERENCES AND RELATED QUESTIONS

(b) COOPERATION IN FISHERIES IN AFRICA (continued) (E/1994/L.20)

Draft decision E/1994/L.20

Mr. BARAC (Romania), introducing draft decision E/1994/L.20, said that an agreed text had been drafted in informal consultations, in view of which he recommended adoption of the draft decision without a vote.

Draft decision E/1994/L.20 was adopted.

SOCIAL, HUMANITARIAN AND HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY BODIES, CONFERENCES AND RELATED QUESTIONS (continued)

(i) INTERNATIONAL DECADE FOR NATURAL DISASTER REDUCTION (continued) (E/1994/L.24/Rev.1)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.24/Rev.1

Mr. DJACTA (Observer for Algeria), introducing draft resolution E/1994/L.24/Rev.1, said that Thailand had joined the sponsors. The principal aim of the draft resolution was to focus on implementation of the Yokohama Strategy for a Safer World, adopted at the World Conference on natural Disaster Reduction in May 1994. It was crucial for the Economic and Social Council to endorse the outcome of the Conference and to recommend adoption by the General Assembly of a resolution that would support activities within the framework of the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction. He trusted that the draft resolution would be adopted by consensus.

Mrs. IRISH (Canada) said that her delegation wished to join the sponsors of the draft resolution.

Ms. INAGA (Japan), supported by Mr. DJACTA (Observer for Algeria), said that paragraph 23 of the draft resolution should be amended by the addition, at the end of the paragraph, of the words: "carried out by the Economic and Social Council at its substantive session in 1994".

Ms. SCHMITZ (Germany) said that Germany was a full member of the Council, not an observer as suggested in a footnote to the draft resolution.

(j) CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT (continued) (E/1994/L.25)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.25

Mr. MANIMEKALAI (India), introducing draft resolution E/1994/L.25 on behalf of Cuba, Thailand and Sri Lanka, in addition to his own delegation, said that there were various amendments to paragraph 3: the final phrase of the chapeau, "when undertaking ... to Decade", should be moved to the beginning of paragraph 3 (a); the words "large-scale" should be deleted from paragraph 3 (a); and the end of paragraph 4 should read: "a study of the cultural factors influencing development as a potential creator...".

(d) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued) (E/1994/24; E/1994/L.15 and L.26)
Action on draft decisions contained in the report of the Commission on Human Rights (E/1994/24; E/1994/L.15)

Draft decision 24

Mr. SIDDIG (Observer for Sudan) said that human rights issues had become increasingly politicized in recent times, as exemplified by the draft decision before the Council. The sole aim of the draft decision was to undermine the Government of the Sudan, which had already voted against it at the fiftieth session of the Commission on Human Rights. His delegation was firmly opposed to politicizing human rights issues, which should be dealt with in a neutral and unbiased manner. The Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Sudan had failed to investigate the real situation in the country, and the draft decision before the Council was in fact based on unfounded accusations.

At the request of the representative of Cuba, a recorded vote was taken on draft decision 24.

In favour: Angola, Australia, Bahamas, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Madagascar, Mexico, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Suriname, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Against: Bangladesh, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Pakistan

Abstaining: Egypt, Ethiopia, Nigeria, Philippines, Sri Lanka

Draft decision 24 was adopted by 36 votes to 7, with 5 abstentions.

Mr. MUCH (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union had supported adoption of the draft decision as an expression of its concern at the human rights situation in the Sudan, and in support of the Special Rapporteur. The refusal of the Government of the Sudan to cooperate with the Special Rapporteur was unacceptable.

Mr. OTUVELU (Nigeria) said that his delegation had abstained, since it was important not to create obstacles to the improvements taking place in the Sudan.

Mr. MONGBE (Benin) said that his delegation, had it been present, would have voted in favour of draft decision.

Draft decision 25

Draft decision 25 was adopted.

Draft decision 26

Draft decision 26 was adopted.

Draft decision 27

Draft decision 27 was adopted.

Draft decision 28

Mr. MRA (Myanmar) said that a politically-motivated assessment of the human rights situation in a country would give only a distorted picture — objective realities must be taken into account. The Commission on Human Rights resolution on Myanmar was a politicized, unbalanced and intrusive text, which failed to recognize the positive developments in the country. His delegation could not accept such interference in the internal affairs of Myanmar.

The promotion of human rights could best be achieved through cooperation and understanding of the situation in a country, rather than through coercion. The positive accomplishments in Myanmar, through the country's own efforts, should be given full encouragement. The Government's endeavours to bring about national reconciliation would undoubtedly promote regional peace and security.

His Government had an unbroken record of cooperating as much as possible with the Commission on Human Rights, and that cooperation would continue to the extent permitted by national circumstances. With respect to the comments by several delegations on the case of Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, he noted that she had been placed under political convictions. The restraining order was the most lenient measure possible under existing legislation.

Draft decision 28 was adopted.

Draft decision 29

Draft decision 29 was adopted.

Draft decision 30

Draft decision 30 was adopted.

Draft decision 31

Draft decision 31 was adopted.

Draft decision 32

Draft decision 32 was adopted.

Draft decision 33

Draft decision 33 was adopted.

Draft decision 34

Draft decision 34 was adopted.

Draft decision 35

The PRESIDENT drew attention to the statement on the programme budget implications of the draft decision contained in document E/1994/L.15.

Mr. FERNANDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) proposed that in the first sentence of draft decision 35 the word "reaffirming" be inserted before the words "Commission on Human Rights resolution 1993/98 of 12 March 1993", to specify that the Council was reaffirming that resolution.

The PRESIDENT drew attention to the fact that there had been some inconsistencies in the various language versions of draft decision 35 and suggested that the Council adopt the proposal of the representative of the

(The President)

United States of America to make any corrections needed to harmonize all versions of the text.

It was so decided.

Draft decision 35 was adopted.

Draft decision 36

Draft decision 36 was adopted by consensus.

Draft decision on the situation of human rights in Iraq (E/1994/L.26)

The PRESIDENT said that the draft decision on the situation of human rights in Iraq had been inadvertently omitted from the final version of the report of the Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. ALI (Iraq) said that his delegation was puzzled by the procedural implications of the draft decision and by its contents. From a procedural point of view, his delegation wondered how amendments could be made by the Council to a draft decision that had been adopted by the Commission on Human Rights. A footnote on page 1 of the draft decision contained in document E/1994/L.26 had indicated that a corrigendum would be issued subsequently. His delegation was of the view that the Commission on Human Rights should first issue a corrigendum on the bases of which the Council could then take action.

Secondly, his delegation categorically rejected the draft decision on the basis of its contents. It believed that the Commission on Human Rights had adopted resolution 1994/74, approving the Commission's decision to extend the mandate of the Special Rapporteur for one additional year, for political motives that were far removed from considerations of human rights. The Special Rapporteur, who had been appointed to make a thorough study of the violations of human rights in Iraq, had never been impartial and had demonstrated animosity towards Iraq by including unverified falsehoods in his report. Despite its procedural and substantive objections regarding the draft decision under consideration, his delegation reaffirmed its willingness to cooperate with the Commission the Commission on Human Rights, the Centre on Human Rights and other agencies known for their neutrality in issues of human rights.

Mr. FALL (Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights) said that the Centre for Human Rights, in addition to other functions, acted as secretariat for the Commission on Human Rights and in that capacity had corrected the error regarding the omission of the draft decision under consideration from the report of the Commission on Human Rights.

At the request of the representative of Cuba, a recorded vote was taken.

In favour: Australia, Bahamas, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Egypt, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Ireland,

/...

Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Mexico, Nigeria, Norway, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Suriname, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Venezuela

Against: None

Abstaining: Angola, Bangladesh, Bhutan, China, Cuba, India, Indonesia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Pakistan, Philippines, Sri Lanka, United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe

The draft decision was adopted by 37 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.

Mr. MUCH (Germany) speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union had voted in favour of the draft decision to express its extreme concern regarding the continuation of flagrant violations of human rights in Iraq, including summary and arbitrary executions, torture, disappearances and arbitrary arrests and detentions. The European Union again appealed to the Government of Iraq to cooperate fully with the Special Rapporteur by inviting him to visit Iraq, by replying without delay in a comprehensive manner to his questions and by allowing entry of human rights monitors into the country.

Draft decision 9

The PRESIDENT recalled that the Council had agreed to postpone consideration of the draft decision pending the outcome of informal consultations on the amendment proposed by the delegation of Cuba.

Mr. FERNANDEZ PALACIOS said that his delegation had proposed that the draft decision be amended in accordance with paragraph 4 of Commission on Human Rights resolution 1994/32 and that the words "on the basis of the mandate established by the Commission on Human Rights" be inserted after the words "by the States concerned".

Mr. KUEHL (United States of America) said that if the Council intended to amend the draft decision so that it corresponded more closely to resolution 1994/32, then his delegation proposed inserting the language of operative paragraph 2, which thanked the experts for the rigour with which they had performed their task.

Mr. MUCH (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said it was unnecessary to weigh down the draft decision with additional words from the resolution when they did not add anything of substance to the decision.

Mr. FENN (United Kingdom) endorsed the statement of the representative of Germany, and proposed amending the draft decision so that it reflected more fully the working contained in operative paragraph 11 of resolution 1994/32, which encouraged Governments to consider inviting the

* The delegation of Bhutan subsequently informed the Council that it had intended to vote in favour of the draft decision.

(Mr. Fenn, United Kingdom)

Working Group to their countries so as to enable the Group to discharge its protection mandate even more effectively and to make concrete recommendations concerning the promotion of human rights.

Mr. DEKANY (Hungary) endorsed the statements of the representatives of Germany and the United Kingdom and sought clarification from the Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights as to whether it was correct the draft decisions were prepared by the Secretariat so as to enable the Council to take informed decisions regarding the financial implications of resolutions adopted by the Commission on Human Rights.

Mr. FALL (Assistant Secretary-General for Human Rights) said that the Council had the full right to adopt or reject partially or fully any text submitted to it summing up the decisions or recommendations of the Commission on Human Rights. Thus, delegations were entitled to submit or reject amendments to those draft decisions recommendations.

The PRESIDENT, at the suggestion of the representative of Benin and other delegation, proposed that a working group composed of all interested delegations should prepare an amended text of draft decision 9 to be submitted to the Council for decision.

It was so decided.

(g) CRIME PREVENTION AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE (continued) (E/1994/31 and Add.1, E/1994/13)

The PRESIDENT drew attention to the report of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice on its third session and to the report of the Secretary-General on progress made in the implementation of Economic and Social Council resolutions 1992/22 and 1993/31.

Mr. MUCH (Germany) said that he would circulate a statement on behalf of the European Union giving its views on the two reports for the information of Council members.

Mr. YE Dapo (China) said that his delegation had studied with interest the report of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, and was pleased to see that, after three years of operation, the Commission had established basic working methods. In the light of its limited resources, however, the Commission should focus its work on priority areas, in accordance with its mandate under General Assembly resolution 46/152. Crime posed a threat to all countries, and the United Nations should pay more attention to that field, giving priority to the crime problems of developing countries. His delegation welcomed the forthcoming international conferences on various aspects of crime prevention and control, which would provide useful opportunities for increased coordination and cooperation. China attached

/...

(Mr. Ye Dapo, China)

great importance to that problem and would increase its cooperation in the fight against organized crime.

Mr. TARABRIN (Russian Federation) said that his delegation supported the focus in the report of the Commission on the priority areas of combating transnational organized crime and money-laundering of proceeds from criminal activity. It also supported the decision to hold a world ministerial conference on organized transnational crime. It would be extremely useful if that conference could produce an analytical review of international legislation and a harmonization of approaches to the problem along with proposals for assistance to intergovernmental bodies in that area. The international community must also work to counteract such new and dangerous manifestations as the links between organized crime, terrorism and drug trafficking.

With regard to money-laundering, the Ninth Congress on Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, to be held in early 1995, should result in effective recommendations within the mandate established in resolution 46/152. As for environmental crime, the Commission should be given a mandate to continue its studies in that area and to submit recommendations for model national legislation.

The work of the United Nations in developing a universal system of norms and standards in crime prevention and criminal justice had been outstanding. His delegation wished to stress the need to implement existing standards and to study problems for which new ones might be required. It was important to affirm that the newly-independent States were still bound by existing international legal obligations. Member States should intensify efforts to strengthen the financial resources of the United Nations Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme.

Ms. MURUGESAN (India) said that her Government wished to reiterate the importance it attached to the work of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, particularly in the establishment of universal standards. Its financial resources must be increased in order for it to perform its work effectively.

Mr. GULEV (Ukraine) said that his delegation attached importance to international cooperation in the training of law enforcement personnel, dissemination of information and expansion of international activities. Advisory services to countries in transition and developing countries were very important. It also endorsed the priorities expressed by the Commission in its report.

At the Ninth Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, specific themes should be set out to avoid duplication of

(Mr. Gulev, Ukraine)

effort. Despite its economic and social problems, Ukraine was attempting to combat crime and to establish a state of law, and it was in the process of drawing up a new procedural code. One of its main problems was illegal migration, an area where little legislation currently existed. In coordination with other States, it was attempting to devise measures to combat the problem.

Action on draft decisions contained in the report of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (E/1994/31 and Add.1)

Draft resolution I

Draft resolution I was adopted.

Draft resolution II

Draft resolution II was adopted.

Draft resolution III

Draft resolution III was adopted.

Draft resolution IV

Draft resolution IV was adopted.

Draft resolution V

Draft resolution V was adopted.

Mr. TISSOT (United Kingdom) said that his delegation had joined in the adoption without a vote of draft resolution V; nevertheless, it had reservations concerning the language of paragraphs 2, 10 and 11. His delegation had fully associated itself with the oral statement delivered by the secretariat of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice at the Commission's third session on the programme budget implications of the draft resolution. In its capacity as an observer delegation, the United Kingdom had not commented on the resolution or on the oral statements of programme budget implications, as it had interpreted the reference in paragraph 2 to "redeploying overall existing resources" as meaning from within the Commission's existing appropriations. Therefore, it expected that the Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice Programme would redeploy funds from lower to higher priorities.

His delegation fully associated itself with a statement made by the Secretary-General that the issues covered in paragraphs 2, 10 and 11 were essentially matters for the appropriate budgetary bodies of the United Nations. The statement of programme budget implications made it clear that the draft resolution far exceeded the mandate of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. His delegation repeated its view that administrative and budgetary matters were the responsibility of the Fifth Committee, recalling General Assembly resolution 248 B, section VI.

Mr. BIGGAR (Ireland) said that his delegation fully associated itself with the views expressed by the representative of the United Kingdom.

Draft resolution VI

Draft resolution VI was adopted.

Draft resolution VII

Draft resolution VII was adopted.

Draft resolution VIII

Draft resolution VIII was adopted.

The PRESIDENT said that, with respect to paragraph 1 of section I, the issue of the dates for the Ninth Congress on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders would be taken up when the Council considered its item on programme questions.

Draft resolution IX

Draft resolution IX was adopted.

Draft resolution X

Draft resolution X was adopted.

Draft resolution XI

Draft resolution XI was adopted.

Draft resolution XII

Draft resolution XII was adopted.

Draft decision I

Draft decision I was adopted.

Draft decision II

Draft decision II was adopted.

Draft decision III

Draft decision III was adopted.

The PRESIDENT said that he would take it that the Council wished to take note of the report of the Secretary-General contained in document E/1994/13.

It was so decided.

The meeting was suspended at 12.30 p.m. and resumed at 12.50 p.m.

HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued) (E/1994/24; E/1994/L.15 and L.26)

Draft decision 9

Mr. FERNANDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) said that, after consultation, it was proposed that, in the third of the English text of draft decision 9, the phrase "originally established by the Commission" should be inserted after "Working Group".

Draft decision 9, as amended, was adopted.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.



Economic and Social
Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1994/SR.44
25 January 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Substantive session of 1994

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 44th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 26 July 1994, at 10 a.m.

President: Mr. BUTLER (Australia)

CONTENTS

COORDINATION OF THE POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND
OTHER BODIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING THEMES
(continued)

- (c) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREED CONCLUSIONS OF THE 1993 COORDINATION
SEGMENT OF THE COUNCIL RELATING TO (ii) COORDINATION OF THE
ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM IN THE FIELDS OF PREVENTIVE
ACTION AND INTENSIFICATION OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST MALARIA AND
DIARRHOEAL DISEASES, IN PARTICULAR CHOLERA (continued)

SOCIAL, HUMANITARIAN AND HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY
BODIES, CONFERENCES AND RELATED QUESTIONS (continued)

- (c) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO
COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE
INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS
(continued)
- (d) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued)
- (e) ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN (continued)

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
COOPERATION (continued)

COORDINATION OF UNITED NATIONS ACTIVITIES RELATED TO HIV/AIDS (continued)

REGIONAL COOPERATION IN THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND RELATED FIELDS

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working
languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in
a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this
document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference
Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 10.40 a.m.

COORDINATION OF THE POLICIES AND ACTIVITIES OF THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND OTHER BODIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM RELATED TO THE FOLLOWING THEMES
(continued)

- (c) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREED CONCLUSIONS OF THE 1993 COORDINATION SEGMENT OF THE COUNCIL RELATING TO (ii) COORDINATION OF THE ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS SYSTEM IN THE FIELDS OF PREVENTIVE ACTION AND INTENSIFICATION OF THE STRUGGLE AGAINST MALARIA AND DIARRHOEAL DISEASES, IN PARTICULAR CHOLERA (continued) (E/1994/L.28)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.28: Malaria and diarrhoeal diseases, in particular, cholera

Mr. BELHIMEUR (Observer for Algeria) introduced draft resolution E/1994/L.28 on behalf of the Group of 77 and China and in accordance with rule 72 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council. The tragedy in Rwanda highlighted the need for the international community to redouble its efforts in the struggle against malaria and diarrhoeal diseases, in particular cholera. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted by a very broad consensus.

Mr. von KIENLIN (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that the European Union welcomed the introduction of the draft resolution and its general thrust. The question should become a standing item for consideration during the Council's general segment. Referring to paragraph 5, he noted that, although extensive consultations had taken place on a special co-sponsored programme for HIV/AIDS, the Organization did not yet have much experience with such programmes and it might be premature to establish another one. Adding the phrase "or improving existing mechanisms with the aim of mobilizing..." after "special co-sponsored programmes" would make it clear that already existing mechanisms for the control of malaria and diarrhoeal diseases should also be considered.

Ms. WILLIAMS (United States of America) said that her delegation, too, welcomed the introduction of the draft resolution and its basic thrust. It also agreed that the question should continue to be discussed by the Council during the general segment. Her delegation appreciated the fact that the European Union wished to propose changes in paragraph 5. It, too, would put forward proposals concerning that paragraph in informal consultations with the sponsors. In particular, it would propose language which would give the Secretary-General the necessary latitude to develop his own ideas and which would emphasize the need for increased attention to the question and better coordination among United Nations agencies in that field.

Mr. MONGBE (Benin), noting the spirit of understanding which had prevailed throughout the deliberations, requested all delegations wishing to propose changes to the draft resolution to meet with the sponsors in informal consultations.

Mr. CARMICHAEL (Canada) said that his delegation, too, strongly supported the draft resolution and would welcome an opportunity to participate in the informal consultations.

SOCIAL, HUMANITARIAN AND HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS: REPORTS OF SUBSIDIARY BODIES, CONFERENCES AND RELATED QUESTIONS (continued)

- (c) IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECLARATION ON THE GRANTING OF INDEPENDENCE TO COLONIAL COUNTRIES AND PEOPLES BY THE SPECIALIZED AGENCIES AND THE INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS ASSOCIATED WITH THE UNITED NATIONS (continued) (E/1994/L.29)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.29: Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples by the specialized agencies and the international institutions associated with the United Nations

Mrs. VALLE CAMINO (Cuba), introducing draft resolution E/1994/L.29, said that draft resolutions on the implementation of the Declaration traditionally provided an opportunity for the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples to inform the specialized agencies and international institutions associated with the United Nations of the economic and social situation of Non-Self-Governing Territories and for those agencies and institutions to indicate how they could contribute to improving that situation. The contribution of the specialized agencies and international institutions was more vital than ever at a time when most of the Non-Self-Governing Territories were small island States with special problems. The adoption of an assistance programme designed to satisfy the needs of those Territories, by with regard to the diversification of their economies, would help to reduce their dependence on external factors and pave the way for the full exercise of their right to self-determination.

She referred to General Assembly resolution 43/47, which set the goal of ushering in a world free from colonialism in the twenty-first century. Like previous resolutions, draft resolution E/1994/L.29 requested the Council to recommend specific action to the specialized agencies and international institutions. It contained a specific reference to the Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, held recently in Barbados, which connection drew attention to paragraph 8. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution, as revised during informal consultations, would be widely supported in the Council and adopted by consensus.

Ms. WILLIAMS (United States of America) expressed concern about some of the language in the draft resolution. Her delegation had already indicated its willingness to work with other interested delegations on certain drafting changes. While it believed that the reference to the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States was positive, it none the less wished to ensure that that reference and the implications of the resolution were consistent with the Charter of the United Nations.

(d) HUMAN RIGHTS QUESTIONS (continued) (E/1994/L.32)

Draft decision E/1994/L.32: Composition of the staff of the Centre for Human Rights

Mr. FERNANDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) introduced draft decision E/1994/L.32 on behalf of its sponsors, which had been joined by the Republic of Iran. The draft decision was intended to ensure compliance with the request contained in paragraph 3 of Commission on Human Rights resolution 1994/56. If a report on the current geographical distribution of posts in the staff of the Centre was submitted, the sponsors would reassess the need for the draft decision and would consider deferring discussion of the report to the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly after the Economic and Social Council had taken note of it.

Draft decision 23 of the Commission on Human Rights on the situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

Mr. REZVANI (Observer for the Islamic Republic of Iran), speaking in exercise of the right of reply, referred to the statement delivered on behalf of the European Union on 22 July. The position of his Government on draft decision 23 of the Commission on Human Rights had already been made clear. The draft decision was politically motivated and deliberately ignored the real situation of human rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran. For three consecutive years prior to the forty-eighth session of the Commission, his delegation had been completely open, and resolutions had been adopted by consensus. That demonstrated that it had no difficulty with constructive and positive cooperation. However, that consensus-building approach had been undermined when the Group of Western European and Other States had submitted an accusatory draft resolution in 1992. At that point, the spirit of cooperation had given way to suspicion and confrontation and there seemed to be no change in sight. Indeed, during the fiftieth session of the Commission on Human Rights, the representative of the European Union had referred to a secretly drafted resolution.

Iranian authorities had taken thorough and extensive measures to bring to justice the perpetrators of crimes against Iranian Christian priests. Hard evidence and terrorist confessions implicated the terrorist organization Mojahedin-e Khalq (MKO) in the recent assassinations of Christians and the bombing of holy shrines in Iran. Some Western countries, however, preferred to ignore that fact and to call for the protection of Iranian Christians, who had been engaging in religious activities in complete freedom.

Following the recent tragic incidents and the terrorists confession, the ambassadors of the States member of the European Union in Tehran had been invited to visit the perpetrators. Unfortunately, thus far, none of them had accepted that invitation. It was well known that many Western countries were a base and a safe haven for MKO terrorists. His Government had concrete

(Mr. Rezvani)

evidence that some of the terrorist activities of that organization were routinely carried out by telephone to the MKO headquarters in Western countries, where no attempt was being made to put an end to such activities. His delegation once again called upon the Western countries not to allow terrorists to use their countries as bases for murder.

(*) ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN (continued) (E/1994/L.30)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.30: International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women

Mrs. PICO ESTRADA (Observer for Argentina) introduced the draft resolution on behalf of its sponsors, which had been joined by Angola, Bolivia and the Philippines, and in accordance with rule 72 of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council. The sponsors hoped that the draft resolution would be adopted without a vote.

Mr. BELHIMEUR (Observer for Algeria) referred to a draft resolution contained in the report on the thirty-eighth session of the Commission on the Status of Women (E/1994/27), entitled "Women and children in the process of the elimination of apartheid and the establishment of a democratic South Africa". That draft resolution had been elaborated by the Group of African States at the most recent session of the Commission on the Status of Women and endorsed by the Group of 77 and China. The Council had been requested to defer action on it pending the outcome of informal consultations. With the election of a democratic Government in South Africa, the draft resolution was no longer relevant. The Group of African States wished to withdraw it in accordance with the provisions of rule 67 (2) of the rules or procedure of the Economic and Social Council.

The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to adopt the Algerian proposal to withdraw the resolution in accordance with the provisions of rule 67 (2) of the rules of procedure of the Economic and Social Council.

It was so decided.

OPERATIONAL ACTIVITIES OF THE UNITED NATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION (continued) (E/1994/L.27)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.27: Operational activities segment of the Economic and Social Council

The PRESIDENT said that the Council had been requested to defer on draft resolution E/1994/L.27, submitted by the President so that it could be taken simultaneously with the decision on a theme for the operational activities segment of the substantive session of 1995.

He drew the Council's attention to two decisions of the Executive Boards of the United Nations Development Programme/United Nations Population Fund

/...

(The President)

which required action by the General Assembly, namely, decision 94/12 entitled "Office for Project Services" and decision 94/21 entitled "Commemoration of the Twenty-fifth anniversary of the operations of the United Nations Population Fund" (E/1994/35 (Part III)). If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to endorse those two decisions and recommend their approval to the General Assembly.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT said that, if he heard no objection, he would take it that the Council wished to take note of the report of the Secretary-General on progress in the implementation of General Assembly resolution 47/199 on operational activities (E/1994/64 and Add.1 and 2), the report of the Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme/United Nations Population on the work of its first regular session (E/1994/35, Parts I, II and III), the report of the Executive Board of the United Nations Children's Fund on the work of its first regular session of 1994 (E/1994/34, Parts I, II and III), the report of the Committee on Food Aid Policies and Programmes (E/1994/84) and the note by the Secretariat on a summary of issues before the Economic and Social Council at the operational activities segment (E/1994/93).

It was so decided.

COORDINATION OF UNITED NATIONS ACTIVITIES RELATED TO HIV/AIDS (continued)
(E/1994/L.18/Rev.1)

Mr. CARMICHAEL (Canada) said that Nepal and Paraguay had joined the sponsors of draft resolution E/1994/L.18/Rev.1.

The PRESIDENT drew attention to the procedure for setting up the joint and co-sponsored United Nations programme on HIV/AIDS under draft resolution E/1994/L.18/Rev.1 and stressed that the Council, at the final stages of consultations, would have to establish clear principles of governance for the programme. For example, it had not yet been determined to which part of the United Nations system the programme would report. Referring to paragraph 15 of the annex to the draft resolution, he pointed out that the theme group on HIV/AIDS to be established would be very much under the direction of the resident coordinator. He took it that the Council wished to adopt draft resolution A/1994/L.18/Rev.1.

It was so decided.

REGIONAL COORDINATION IN THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND RELATED FIELDS
(A/49/104-E/1994/90, A/49/205-E/1994/91, E/1994/50 and Add.1 and 2,
E/1994/51-55, E/1994/61 and 81)

Mr. BERTHELOT [Executive Secretary, Economic Commission for Europe (ECE)] stressed the importance of supporting the reform process in the economies in transition since that was a long and complex process and had a high social cost. The development of the economic situation in Central Europe

(Mr. Berthelot)

had given rise to a certain optimism, while economic trends in the economies of the Commonwealth of Independent States were cause for concern, although notable progress had been made in the field of inflation. Cooperation among United Nations agencies in assisting the transition efforts of the countries concerned was vitally important. At a recent gathering of representatives of those agencies for the European region, agreement had been reached on the need to give equal attention to social concerns so that they did not have a negative impact on economic development.

The elaboration of legal instruments and norms acceptable to all countries and the development of infrastructure networks across national boundaries were powerful factors in favour of integration. Many conventions, norms and standards relating to trade, transport and the environment had been negotiated in the ECE framework. Most of them had a direct or indirect effect on trade. Other of the Commission had to be taken into account by non-ECE exporters in view of the important ECE market. Still others, aimed mainly at environmental protection, affected production processes and generally led to increases in production costs. That might trigger trade disputes between ECE producers and those that were not obliged to comply with strict norms. The Commission intended to explore with UNCTAD, WTO and the other regional commissions the differences in norms and their impact on trade as well as possibilities for harmonization.

The Economic Commission for Europe was cooperating in the follow-up to the Rio Conference and felt that it was important to make a joint contribution to preparations for and the follow-up to the World Summit for Social Development. The Commission had also proposed that the regional commissions should undertake a joint analysis of the impact of international immigration on both the host countries and the countries of origin.

Mr. AHMED [Executive Secretary, Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP)] said that the continued high growth rate achieved by developing countries in the Asian and Pacific region was substantially due to domestic policy reforms to ensure macroeconomic stability, the expanded role of the private sector, establishment of competitive domestic markets, liberalization of trade and exchange rates, greater openness through foreign investment and technologies and a wide range of fiscal, financial and institutional reforms. Regional cooperation was also playing an important role in sustaining economic growth. The unique Asian solution to practical problems of economic cooperation among countries at different stages of development was based on the establishment of growth triangles, designed to exploit complementarities in labour, capital and natural resources in neighbouring countries.

(Mr. Ahmed)

A particularly welcomed development had been the strengthening of cooperation among subregional organizations, which should enable countries to take advantage of the growing potential in intraregional trade, investment and technology transfer. At its fiftieth session, the Commission had given special emphasis to strengthening cooperation among ESCAP and subregional organizations in order to facilitate the exchange of experience and promote growth.

Integrating the region's least developed, land-locked and island economies as well as the economies in transition into the mainstream of development remained a major concern. The Commission had taken a number of important in that regard decisions, including the adoption of a resolution on investment-related technology transfer, and had reviewed progress made in implementing the action plan for regional economic cooperation in trade and investment. At its fiftieth session, the Commission had also drawn up a draft action plan on infrastructure development in Asia and the Pacific, showing the increasing constraints on growth resulting from deficiencies in physical infrastructure and the magnitude of investment required to overcome those deficiencies. In coming years, ESCAP would be engaged in the task of assisting countries in mobilizing resources for infrastructures development.

The concern about environmental degradation due to rising energy requirements, overuse of land for agricultural production and unsustainable exploitation of forest resources had also been given considerable attention. The Commission had underscored the need for prudent economic policies with adequate safeguards for environmental protection and planning as well as integration of sustainable-development issues into decision-making.

In spite of domestic policy reforms and increased regional cooperation, the performance of the region's economies would significantly depend on the external economic environment. At its fiftieth session, the Commission had expressed optimism that the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiations was a major step towards promotion of a freer world trading system. Nevertheless, there was concern at the tendency among some developed market economies to link social-policy issues to the international trade agenda.

The Commission would continue to do its best to accelerate the development of the disadvantaged economies of the region by encouraging them to strengthen domestic policy reforms and promoting economic and technical cooperation among developing countries within the region. Nevertheless, the Council should be aware of the inadequacy of official financial support. Most donor countries had failed to meet the internationally accepted targets for ODA, even though many new countries had joined the ranks of those requesting

(Mr. Ahmed)

such assistance. Lastly, he expressed concern at the fact that international arms producers and traders were vigorously pushing the sale of weapons in the region. The potential destabilizing impact of such an arms build-up was obvious.

Mr. ROSENTHAL [Executive Secretary, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC)] said that while growth in Latin American and Caribbean countries had been moderate, intra-Latin American trade had intensified as a result of new integration agreements. However, there remained three main obstacles to the development of the countries in the region: in spite of diversification and expansion of the export sector, imports had grown faster than exports, levels of savings and investment were insufficient and there was an immense backlog of social problems. With regard to the ECLAC programme of work, member Governments had agreed that the primary feature should be relevance. At its twenty-fifth session, ECLAC had discussed ways to enhance the linkages of the countries of the region with the international economy and to develop intraregional economic integration. In the current process of restructuring and revitalization of the United Nations in the economic and social fields, adequate consideration should be given to the value of the regional and multisectoral approach taken by ECLAC.

Mr. YAKER [Executive Secretary, Economic Commission for Africa (ECA)] said the tragic situation of many African countries deserved the immediate attention of the Economic and Social Council which should play a vital role in establishing preventive measures to ensure greater participation by Africa in the world economy. Since the early 1980s, the African continent had experienced the continuous deterioration of economic and social conditions, reflected in limited access to health services, education and other basic amenities. The region's economies had been further distressed by natural and man-made disasters such as drought and civil strife. To a large extent, future prospects depended on the establishment of a stable political climate to build the confidence of investors. The region should meet those political challenges by creating an environment conducive to the increased participation of the private sector and non-governmental organizations. The international community should render support by means of effective debt reduction measures, increased resource flows and improved terms of trade.

The activities of ECA promoted reform and covered a wide range of issues which included human resources development and utilization; information systems development; economic cooperation and integration; agriculture and rural development; energy resources and science and technology for development. In their resolve to integrate their economies, African Governments had established the African Economic Community on the basis of a

/...

(Mr. Yaker)

regional and integrated approach to development. The development of a regional position on global issues such as trade, population and Agenda 21 depended on the ability of ECA to assume a central coordinating role. An overemphasis on national issues had led to the marginalization of regional commissions and their activities. In addition, regional commissions continued to be bypassed in their legitimate claim to extrabudgetary resources for executing regional operational projects and activities. However, ECA welcomed recent recognition of the need to strengthen interregional cooperation arrangements between institutions to allow for cross-fertilization and harmonization of activities.

In the light of recent developments in South Africa, including the dismantling of apartheid and the holding of free and fair elections, he endorsed the draft recommendation on the readmission of democratic South Africa as a member of the Economic Commission for Africa (E/1994/50). Mindful that Africa's development was primarily the responsibility of African Governments, he reaffirmed the commitment of ECA to promote the socio-economic development of that continent and called upon the development partners of ECA to support its efforts.

Mr. BAKJAJI [Executive Secretary, Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA)] said that the region of Western Asia continued to suffer the consequences of wars and political conflicts. The economic recession had given rise to uncertainty among the population, particularly young people, and had led to increased unemployment and deteriorating economic and social conditions which threatened political and social stability. The current and future economic outcome of the region of Western Asia depended on several factors, including the ultimate resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict which had exhausted enormous human and material resources that could have been utilized for the economic and social development of the region. The countries of Western Asia were in transition to a market economy, and many had implemented economic reforms and policies aimed at increasing the role of the private sector in development.

In response to recent developments on the international scene, the secretariat of ESCWA had modified its programme of work in order to enhance its role and to become a more efficient centre of support for the promotion of economic integration among its member States. In order to meet the needs of the region in future decades, ESCWA had concentrated its activities in five basic areas: use of natural resources, improving standards of living, economic cooperation and development, regional development and specific issues affecting the least developed countries and areas affected by war. Modifications regarding the mid-term plan for the period 1992-1997 had been

(Mr. Bakjaji)

introduced to strengthen technical cooperation by adopting an approach based on the economic and social priorities of member States. With a view to strengthening the role of ESCWA and enhancing the efficiency of its services, the secretariat had attempted to strengthen the capacity of governmental and non-governmental institutions to promote sustainable development and had set up a regional forum to discuss issues as they emerged.

Turning to the report of the Secretary-General on regional cooperation in the economic, social and cultural fields contained in document E/1994/50, he introduced it on behalf of the executive secretaries of the regional commissions. The past year had produced some tangible results from the Secretary-General's efforts to strengthen the regional commissions. Among major developments, an additional 20 per cent of the posts for regional advisers had been decentralized to the regional commissions, increasing the human resources at their disposal from 40 per cent to 60 per cent of total staff. In the field of natural resources and energy, the General Assembly had agreed to decentralize nine Professional and nine General Service posts. While that fell short of expectations, it was hoped that through the recently established Management Board of the United Nations Technical Cooperation Programme in Natural Resources and Energy, further improvements in the implementation of an integrated programme could be achieved. He also noted the establishment of a UNDP/regional commissions task force which would serve as a forum to address issues of common concern.

The regional commissions had followed up on the Secretary-General's initiative to establish more systematic annual inter-agency consultations to review trends and exchange information on programmes and initiatives, which was discussed in detail in chapter III of the report. He drew attention to draft resolutions and resolutions adopted by the regional commissions calling for action by the Economic and Social Council contained in section I A. Among the decisions of the various regional commissions contained in section I B, special mention should be made of resolutions concerning the preparatory work for the Fourth World Conference on Women, the World Summit for Social Development, the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements and the issue of economic cooperation and integration in each region. The brief summary on the work of the regional commissions in the past year and on regional cooperation contained in section II provided an overview of the rapidly changing political, economic and social environment within which those activities had taken place.

Section III dealt with the meetings of the executive secretaries and their deliberation on matters such as coordination, decentralization of authority and administration, relations with UNDP, joint programmes with

(Mr. Bakjaji)

specialized agencies, training, and regional preparations for the forthcoming international conferences. Section IV contained a proposal for interregional cooperation in social development dealing with the impact of international migration in countries of destination and countries of origin. Finally, section V contained the consolidated report of the regional commissions on the conclusions of a review of the relevant provisions of chapter 38 of Agenda 21 and plans for its implementation.

Mr. MONGBE (Benin) said that he regretted that insufficient time had been allotted for consideration of the reports of the executive secretaries of the regional economic commissions. He hoped that the Council could improve on its working methods for future sessions.

As for the report of the Economic Commission for Africa, it came as no surprise that many problems had been raised and negative trends reported. Africa was among the five top priorities for United Nations action and many programmes had been designed, but no resources had been allocated for their implementation. The United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s was almost carbon copy of the Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development. Both shared a cruel lack of resources for implementation and as the coordinator of economic and social activities within the United Nations system, the Council must take action to improve the situation. He had grown weary of repeating himself on the subject of the poverty of Africa. The international community must shoulder its responsibilities in that area.

He regretted that the report of the Secretary-General contained no mention of the Convention to Combat Desertification and it should have reflected the importance Africa attached to that Convention.

The PRESIDENT said that the time available for the consideration of the item had been truncated as a consequence of the institutional reform of the Council and the elimination of the economic and social committees. The Council could decide, however, to allocate more time to any subject, and would do so in the present case. The documentation had been available to delegations for study for quite some time.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.



Economic and Social
Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1994/SR.45
25 January 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Substantive session of 1994

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 45th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 26 July 1994, at 3 p.m.

President:

Mr. BUTLER

(Australia)

CONTENTS

REGIONAL COOPERATION IN THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND RELATED FIELDS (continued)

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

REGIONAL COOPERATION IN THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND RELATED FIELDS (continued)
(A/49/104-E/1994/90, A/49/205-E/1994/91, E/1994/50 and Add.1 and 2, E/1994/51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 61 and 81)

Mr. AWAAD (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the Group of African States, said that the international community must strengthen its efforts to achieve the goals set by the New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s. In that connection, increased support should be given to the Economic Commission for Africa. The worsening economic and social situation in Africa was closely tied to the failure to implement the Agenda. Although a mid-term review was scheduled for 1995, the Group of States tended to believe that, given the woeful progress achieved so far, the New Agenda for the Development of Africa would suffer the same fate as the United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development, which had been a failure. The Council should therefore adopt the draft resolutions, decisions and recommendations presented by the Economic Commission for Africa in its report.

Mr. SYCHOU (Belarus) said that his delegation supported the decisions of the forty-ninth session of the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), in particular the request by ECE that, in addition to the 10 posts for regional advisers, it should be given adequate human and financial resources, taking into account its areas of competence. His delegation felt that it was very important to support the Trust Fund for Assistance to Countries in Transition so as to ensure their full participation in the ECE programme of workshops and in meetings of ECE subsidiary bodies. It attached great importance to the recommendation adopted at the Commission's forty-eighth session that ECE should be the focal point for coordinating the implementation of General Assembly resolution 48/181.

The Republic of Belarus would participate actively in the regional conference on transport and the environment in 1996. His delegation noted with satisfaction, in paragraph 84 of the report of the Secretary-General (E/1994/50) that assistance to countries in transition had become a guiding principle of the Commission. It also welcomed the continuing process of adaptation of structures and programmes under way in ECE in response to the changing realities in the region, taking into account its comparative advantages. It commended the efforts of ECE to minimize the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster.

His delegation believed that coordination of the work of the regional commissions and global subdivisions of the United Nations should be discussed at a subsequent session of the Council, in the context of operational activities for development. It would be very useful to learn of the problems encountered by regional commissions in their relations with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).

(Mr. Sychou, Belarus)

The proposal for interregional cooperation in studying the impact of international migration in countries of destination and countries of origin was of great interest.

Mr. DUGAN (United States of America) said that while his delegation welcomed the report of the Secretary-General on regional cooperation in the economic, social and related fields (E/1994/50), it was deeply concerned at its late submission, especially since it contained draft decisions and resolutions for immediate action by the Council. In that connection, an initiative was under way to address the late submission of documents at the current session. By definition, the regional commissions were not universal and it was very important to have an overview of their work. Coordination among the regional commissions and between their activities and those of the rest of the United Nations development system, particularly in the operational sphere, must be analysed and encouraged.

Concerning the report of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ESCAP), his delegation welcomed efforts to strengthen inter-agency cooperation at the regional level and the establishment of a regional inter-agency committee for Asia and the Pacific. He welcomed the remark by the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) that the primary feature of the Commission's programme of work should be its relevance. Concerning the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE), as it had concentrated its work on the problem of integration with eastern Europe, he wondered what initiatives had been taken regarding the establishment of an ECE office in eastern Europe. He welcomed the statement by the Executive Secretary of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) on how that Commission was modifying its programme of work in response to both relevant General Assembly resolutions and recent development on the international scene. He agreed with the Executive Secretary of the Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) that the regional dimension was too often overlooked and welcomed his observations on promoting interregional cooperation.

Mr. CUI Tienkai (China) said that he agreed with the recommendations in the report of the Secretary-General on regional cooperation in the economic, social and related fields. Turning to the ESCAP region, he noted that the fiftieth session of ESCAP, held in New Delhi, had been highly successful and had culminated in the adoption of the New Delhi Declaration on strengthening Regional Economic Cooperation in Asia and the Pacific towards the Twenty-first Century and the draft action plan on infrastructure development in Asia and the Pacific. He hoped that ESCAP would continue to promote increase through economic cooperation, mutual investment and trade

(Mr. Cui Tiankai, China)

within the region and that economic cooperation with other regions of the world would likewise be based on openness and non-discrimination. Insufficient infrastructure was a major bottleneck in the region and China supported the Commission's efforts to promote cooperation in that regard. As the external economic environment considerably influenced economic development, countries in the ESCAP region were concerned at the linkage of social policies with international trade.

Concerning the report of the Secretary-General on phase II of the Transport and Communications Decade for Asia and the Pacific (E/1994/61), while ESCAP, the relevant organizations and some donor countries had done much to implement the programmes of the Decade, there was a need to strengthen support for the Decade in order to bring it to a successful conclusion. Although his delegation had no objection to the amendment of ESCAP terms of reference proposed by the Secretary-General in document E/1994/81, it felt it would have been more appropriate and more in keeping the rules procedure to have sought the views of members and associate members beforehand and for ESCAP to have submitted the amendment to the Council.

Mr. von KIENLIN (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, noted that the reports submitted by the regional commissions provided a good overview of the progress made in the various regions and of the difficulties and differences they were facing. However, the late submission of the combined report had made it difficult for delegations to consult on a number of the draft resolutions recommended for adoption. As the European Union had difficulties with a number of resolutions, especially those concerning Africa because of their considerable financial implications, it would not be possible for it to take action on them at the current meeting.

Mrs. CASTRO de BARISH (Costa Rica) said that the summary of the survey of economic conditions in the region of Latin America and the Caribbean, 1993 (E/1994/53) was sound, especially as far as Costa Rica was concerned. Since July 1993, ECLAC had published several relevant and valuable multidisciplinary studies, including "Latin America and the Caribbean: policies to improve linkages with the global economy", "Open regionalism in Latin America and the Caribbean: economic integration as a contribution to changing production patterns with social equity" and "The Social Summit: a view from Latin America and the Caribbean". At its twenty-fifth session held at Cartagena, Colombia, the Commission had addressed several pertinent issues, including regional economic integration and a regional approach to the World Summit for Social Development. It had also adopted a Regional Plan of action on Population and Development.

(Mrs. Castro de Barish, Costa Rica)

Turning to procedural issues, it was very important that the current process of restructuring and revitalization of the United Nations in the economic and social fields should give greater attention to the usefulness of a regional, multidisciplinary and multisectoral approach. Her Government hoped that the Council would approve the holding of the twenty-sixth session of ECLAC in San José, Costa Rica, in 1996, as recommended by the Commission.

MR. AL-KHANDARI (Kuwait), referring to document E/1994/55 on the summary of the survey of economic and social developments in the region of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia, particularly paragraphs 6 and 8, said that his country had initiated measures for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of its economy. Kuwait had been forced to borrow on the international financial markets for the first time in its history and now had a huge budget deficit as a direct result of the Gulf crisis. The Government was rationalizing its expenditures and intended to concentrate on developing the non-oil and private sectors. It hoped substantially to reduce the budget deficit by the year 2000. He pointed out that some expenditures had not been covered in the document, and appealed for support from the international community for his country's reconstruction efforts.

MISS MONTAÑO (Observer for Bolivia) asked the Executive Secretary of ECLAC what the Commission was doing to ensure participation by the Latin American and Caribbean region in the elaboration of the proposed Agenda for Development.

MR. PANKIN (Russian Federation) said that following its own reorganization, the Council should consider the work of the regional commissions in a somewhat different manner. His delegation agreed that there was a need to improve the coordination of regional cooperation; that concern had been expressed by the heads of the regional commissions themselves at their regular meetings. At those meetings, there should be greater transparency in providing information on the results achieved and the problems encountered, without awaiting the formal occasion of the Council's annual session.

The role of the regional commissions was expanding, especially in regions where dramatic changes were taking place. The regional commissions were more in touch with local conditions and needs and cooperated more closely with Governments. Their efforts should be enhanced through broader cooperation with other bodies of the United Nations system. There should also be greater coordination of the approaches taken by regional commissions and their executive secretaries to urgent or emerging problems.

The Russian Federation, as a member of two regional commissions, noted that changes were taking place in the emphasis and work of ECE and ESCAP in

(Mr. Pankin, Russian Federation)

response to changing conditions in each region. It felt that both Commissions should be able to diversify their methods of work. In the case of ECE, the expanding circle of participants, not only in terms of numbers but also in terms of territory, naturally called for greater efforts on the part of the Commission and an increase in the corresponding resource allocation. There was also a need to rationalize its work, especially in setting priorities, avoiding duplication and determining which tasks were most urgent.

ECE decision B (49), entitled "Diversification of forms and methods of the Commissions activities designed to assist countries of the region in transition to a market economy and their integration with the European and global economy", was vitally important; the Commission's approach should be extended to other regions. General Assembly resolution 48/181 gave sufficient grounds for strengthening that aspect in the context of regional cooperation.

The council should ensure that its debate on regional cooperation was directed more towards issues of ensuring decentralization, coordination and greater rationalization of work.

Mr. LOZANO (Mexico) expressed appreciation for the activities of ECLAC, especially its efforts to formulate new approaches and policy guidelines for the region aimed at achieving greater and better linkages between the Latin American and Caribbean countries and the global economy and progress in the process of transforming their economic structures and achieving greater social equity. His delegation was also grateful to the Executive Secretary of ECLAC for the support provided in consolidating the Latin American and Caribbean Regional Plan of Action on Population and Development. It reiterated the importance attached by the region to the contribution which ECLAC was making and should make to the region's preparations for the World Summit for Social Development.

His delegation attached great importance to ECLAC resolution 541 (XXV) entitled "Restructuring and revitalization of the United Nations in the economic and social fields: implications for the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean". It supported the activities suggested in the resolution and noted the importance place on the regional commissions, which could play a more active role in the economic and social restructuring process.

His delegation reaffirmed its support for ECLAC and stressed the importance of strengthening ECLAC so that it could continue its efforts to help meet the new requirements of the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean. That could be achieved only if the Commission had the necessary financial resources to carry out its many tasks.

Mr. MALYA (United Republic of Tanzania) said that his delegation felt that issues relating to the proposed international convention to combat desertification in those countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa, had not been adequately reflected in the statement by the Executive Secretary of ECA. One aspect of the convention was the need for urgent action for African drylands; ECA should concentrate on mobilizing support for that action and also on the action to be taken in the interim period before the first conference of States parties.

Mr. BELHIMEUR (Observer for Algeria) expressed deep concern about the alarming situation on the African continent. For several years, Africa had appeared to be an object of concern by the international community. Unfortunately, that concern had been limited to lofty declaration which had not been followed by concrete measures. The United Nations Programme of Action for African Economic Recovery and Development had remained a dead letter. There were signs that the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of African in the 1990 would suffer the same fate.

The difficult negotiations on General Assembly resolution 48/214 had revealed the international community is indifference to Africa.

His delegation hoped that the measures by ECA would be taken into consideration by the Council. It also supported the recommendation to strengthen the capacities of ECA so that it could carry out its role of coordination, follow-up and monitoring of the implementation of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s.

Mr. ETEFFA (Ethiopia) said that it was not clear how predictable economic diversification could be, even if resources were available, since most African subregions were affected by desertification and drought. At times, there was a tendency to view declarations, decisions and resolutions as ends in themselves, rather than as a means to concrete action. It was necessary to address the question of how to measure success, and what mechanisms were needed to translate decisions and resolutions into action, especially in view of the conflicts and political crises which diverted the attention of African countries from development to emergencies and humanitarian intervention. Since African countries did not have the means to implement all the decisions and resolutions that were adopted, it would seem that priority areas needed to be selected.

In many parts of Africa, infrastructure, institutional structures and human skills were all lacking; in that situation, it was not clear whether there were any prospects at all. He agreed that the international community should support Africa in its capacity-building efforts.

Mr. ROSENTHAL (Executive Secretary, Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean), responding to the representative of Bolivia, said that the ECLAC secretariat had participated in consultations on the

(Mr. Rosenthal)

preparation of the Agenda for Development. ECLAC also planned to organize some seminars at the regional or subregional level to seek comments on the text. For a long time, ECLAC had been making its own proposals for development with social equity.

Mr. YAKER (Executive Secretary, Economic Commission for African), referring to the comments by the United States representative on the importance of the role of the regional commissions and of interregional cooperation, said that the United Nations regarded in particular, as an important element of the interregional dimension of international cooperation.

Because of their multidisciplinary and geographical coverage, the regional commissions, could play a greater role in both South-South and North-South cooperation.

ECA shared the concerns of all African delegations about the lack of progress in the implementation of the New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s. It believed that it was important for the United Nations to review the situation in the African continent, drawing lessons from conflicts and their aftermath and the cost of emergency operations. ECA could not overemphasize the need to accord increased resources to Africa, particularly in view of the current international economic environment and the existence of regional economic and even political blocs. The low and declining levels of income in Africa and the very powerful economies of Europe and especially North America made it necessary for the Council to consider issues of the harmony and balance of the world economy and the equitable distribution of national income. Unfortunately, Africa was becoming increasingly marginalized. ECA believed that Africa needed a comprehensive structural adjustment which would entail mobilizing internal resources, reducing security and military costs, and ending conflicts. The Organization of African Unity (OAU) mechanism for conflict prevention, management and resolution was very important in that respect and needed to be provided with the necessary resources.

A global, integrated approach was needed to the problems of African development. ECA welcomed the recent meetings of the Group of Seven, and stressed the importance of the Tokyo international Conference on African Development. It hoped that there would be follow-up in terms of coherent programmes and the necessary resources. The concept of Africa as a continent in transition, which included some very positive elements in respect of democracy, human rights and the role of civil society, was very important.

Replying to the representative of Tanzania, he said that ECA had participated actively in the negotiations on the international convention to combat desertification in those countries experiencing serious drought and

(Mr. Rosenthal)

desertification, particularly in Africa. It also attached great importance to the African instrument included within the framework of the convention and hoped that resources would be allocated by African States and the international community.

On the question raised by the representative of Ethiopia regarding capacity-building in Africa, ECA believed that human development, including the development of science and technology, in cooperation with Africa's partners was the right answer. ECA was developing a plan to that effect and hoped to establish the necessary contacts and adopt the necessary projects and programmes.

On the questions raised by the representatives of Egypt and Algeria regarding the New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s, he recalled that the New Agenda was one of the five main priorities in Africa. The next session of the Administrative Committee on Coordination, to be held in September 1994, would have issues relating to Africa on its agenda. That would be an opportunity for the Secretariat and institutions system-wide to analyse the reports of ECA as Chairman of the inter-agency task force on the implementation of the African Agenda.

Mr. BAKJAJ (Executive Secretary, Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia) said that ESCWA would take into account the comments made by delegations, including those made by the representatives of Kuwait and the United States of America.

Action on draft proposals recommended by the Regional Commissions

The PRESIDENT invited the Council to take action on the draft proposals contained in the report of the Secretary-General on regional cooperation in the economic, social and related fields (E/1994/50).

Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific

The PRESIDENT said that paragraph 1 of the report contained a draft resolution, recommended for adoption by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, entitled "Admission of Armenia as a member of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific". He took it that the Council wished to adopt the draft resolution.

It was so decided.

Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean

The PRESIDENT said that paragraph 2 of the report indicated that the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean had recommended that the Council take a decision approving the convening of the twenty-sixth session of the Commission at San José, Costa Rica, in 1996. He took it that the Council wished to adopt such a decision.

It was so decided.

Economic Commission for Africa

The PRESIDENT drew attention to the five draft resolutions contained in paragraph 3 of the report.

Mr. von Kienlin (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, said that its members had difficulties with the text of all of the draft resolutions. In the case of those with financial implications, they wished to find language leading to a real reallocation of resources, if that was possible, or providing for the allocation of adequate resources for the programmes in question. He therefore proposed that consideration of the draft resolutions be deferred to a later meeting.

M. DUGAN (United States of America) supported the proposal.

Mr. AKPLOGAN (Benin) said it was important that the text of any proposed amendments to the draft resolutions be made available as early as possible so that they could be seen and discussed by the African States.

The proposal to defer consideration of the draft resolutions was adopted.
Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia

The PRESIDENT drew attention to draft resolutions I and III in paragraph 8 of the report, which were procedural in nature.

Draft resolution I and III were adopted.

Amendment of the terms of reference of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (E/1994/81)

The draft decision contained in paragraph 7 of the Note by the Secretary-General (E/1994/81) was adopted.

Reports under agenda item 7 (E/1994/50-55, 61 and 81)

The PRESIDENT proposed that the Council take note of the reports under agenda item 7.

It was so decided.

NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (A/49/215-E/1994/99, E/1994/111)

Mr. STOBY (Director, Division for Policy Coordination and Economic and Social Council Affairs), introducing the report of the open-ended Working Group on the Review of Arrangements for Consultations with Non-Governmental Organizations (A/49/215-E/1994/99), said that the Working Group had had a very successful first session in which a wide range of non-governmental organizations had participated actively. The Working Group had had before it a detailed report by the Secretary-General. After holding inter-sessional consultations in November 1994, at which it would have before it a document to be prepared by its Chairman on updating and possibly expanding the scope of Economic and Social Council resolution 1296 (XLIV), the Working Group would meet in the spring of 1995 to complete its report.

Mrs. LIMJUCO (Philippines), speaking in her capacity as Chairman of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations, introduced the Committee's report (E/1994/111) and drew attention to the draft resolution contained in paragraph 1 of the report.

Ms. MURUGESAM (India) said that her delegation supported the Working Group's report, on the understanding that the summary by the Chairman of the Working Group would serve as guidance for the Group's next session and that the full report of the Group would be a background document for that session. While reiterating its support for wide participation by non-governmental organizations in United Nations activities, India wished to underline its strong reservations with respect of the participation of those non-governmental organizations which indulged in activities inimical to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and those whose activities threatened the peace and internal stability of Member States by promoting divisions along sectarian lines.

The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council take note of the report of the Working Group.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Council wished to adopt the draft resolution contained in paragraph 1 of the report of the Committee on Non-Governmental Organization.

The draft resolution was adopted.

Mr. Stoby (Director, Division for Policy Coordination and Economic and Social Council Affairs) pointed out that paragraph 8 of the resolution requested the Secretary-General to disseminate as broadly as possible among the non-governmental community the report of the Working Group and the documentation for it. The Secretariat would proceed on the understanding that it must implement that request within existing resources.

Mr. FERNANDEZ PALACIOS (Cuba) said that he would like to have an assurance that the documentation would reach non-governmental organizations, particularly those in developing countries, even if it was disseminated within existing resources.

Mr. ISSA (Egypt), speaking on behalf of the States of African Group with reference to item 5 of the Council's agenda, said that in view of the recent positive events in South Africa, an effort was being made to update the Programme of Action for the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination. He invited Member States to submit their proposals for the Programme of Action for the Decade.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.